





THE
PROTESTANT,
A SERIES OF ESSAYS
ON THE
PRINCIPAL POINTS OF CONTROVERSY
BETWEEN THE
Church of Rome
AND
THE REFORMED.

VOL. II.

TENTH EDITION

GLASGOW:
BLACKIE & SON, 38, QUEEN STREET;
5, SOUTH COLLEGE STREET, EDINBURGH;
AND 21, WARWICK SQUARE, LONDON.

MDCCCLXXVII.

GEORGE BROOKMAN, PRINTER, GLASGOW.

CONTENTS

OF

VOLUME SECOND.



No. LI. Introductory observations. Subjects that remain to be discussed. The controversy between the Church of Rome and the Reformed involves the important question, Who is the Saviour of sinners? Papists trust in their own works. The Popish argument of antiquity and universality answered.....	1
LII. Popish relics. Use that is made of them, and the worship that is paid to them. Curious catalogue of relics. Impositions practised with regard to them.....	9
LIII. Popery a system of lying and imposition throughout. Miracles ascribed to relics. Catalogue of relics that belonged to Glasgow Cathedral. Farther impositions. Respect paid to the bones of the prophet, 2 Kings xxiii., and to the bones of Joseph, no argument for the worship of relics.....	17
LIV. Letter from Havannah, with an account of Popish ceremonies practised there. Superstitions practised by Irish Papists, at their holy wells.....	25
LV. Anecdote of Lord Derwentwater. Transubstantiation. The doctrine as defined by the Council of Trent. Hocus-pocus a corruption of <i>hoc est corpus</i> . Criticism, by Dr. Clarke, on the original words translated "this is my body." Doctrine of the French Catechism.....	53
LVI. The subject continued. Exposition of Christ's words on instituting the Lord's Supper. Transubstantiation a most pernicious doctrine. He that professes to believe it, not to be believed in any thing that he says.....	41
LVII. The subject continued. Pretended antiquity of transubstantiation discussed. Proved to be a novelty.....	49
LVIII. The subject continued. Ingenious method of putting the faith of a Priest to the test, by a lady. Absurdity of the doctrine farther exposed. The use of the senses, in judging of miracles. Extract from letters of Philopatriis, in the Morning Post..	57
LIX. The believer in transubstantiation in danger of committing fatal mistakes. The bloodshed which has been occasioned by enforcing the belief of the doctrine. Respect paid by the British Ambassador in Paris to the host. Remarkable speech of Earl Grey, in the House of Lords, on transubstantiation. Remarks upon it..	65
LX. Transubstantiation continued. Anecdote of Queen Elizabeth. Various forms of worship paid to the sacrament. Anecdote by George Buchanan	73
LXI. Idolatrous worship of the host. Respect paid to the host by beasts and insects. On withholding the cup from the laity.....	81
LXII. Sacrifice of the mass. Doctrine of the mass, as laid down by the Douay Catechism,—by the French Catechism. Nature of the mass sacrifice, by Father Pacificus Baker. Decree of the Council of Trent relative to the mass. Fundamental errors of the mass doctrine.....	89
LXIII. Scripture doctrine of sacrifice and atonement stated and illustrated. Popish doctrine sets aside the atonement of Christ.....	97

LXIV. Examination of the alleged Scripture authorities for the mass sacrifice. Priesthood of Melchisedec. Consideration of Bishop Hay's arguments from Scripture.....	105
LXV. Farther consideration of Melchisedec's priesthood. Nothing in his offering to Abraham that resembled the mass sacrifice. <i>Index expurgatorius</i> . No dependence on what Popish authors give as quotations from the ancient Fathers. Misrepresentation of the apostle Paul by the Rhemish translators.....	113
LXVI. Popish Priests pretend to be mediators between God and man. Impiety and absurdity of this pointed out. Letter from Dublin, with four receipts for money paid to procure masses for the dead. Remarks thereon	121
LXVII. Description of the sacred vestments used in celebrating mass. The robes of the Jewish high priest no pattern for the dress of Christian ministers. What is to be done, when the consecrated wafer corrupts and breeds worms. Story of a dog swallowing the consecrated wafer, and what was the consequence...	129
LXVIII. Conformity of Popish idolatry with that of heathenism. Extracts from Dr. Middleton's letters from Rome.....	137
LXIX. The same subject. Extract from letters by Ignotus. St. Patrick's Purgatory.....	145
LXX. Letter to THE PROTESTANT, by W. D., a Papist. Remarks upon it.....	153
LXXI. Further remarks on W. D's. letter. Case of a Popish husband not keeping faith with his Protestant wife, in a letter to the Protestant, by the Rev. R. Cameron. Remarks upon it. Case of a Popish husband maltreating his Protestant wife, exposed in Glasgow police office.....	161
LXXII. The evil and danger of Protestants marrying Papists. Anecdote of a lady governess. Case of a poor widow being obliged to pay money for baptism to her child, in a letter from Mr. Syme, clerk to the Town's Hospital. The money returned. Remarks thereon. Immense sums levied of the Papists in Ireland, from the Sun newspaper.....	169
LXXIII. Lively description of the ceremony of baptizing bells in Canada, in a letter by J. M. D. Reference to a similar custom at Naples. Account of nunneries in Montreal.....	177
LXXIV. Superstitions in Ireland, by A. O. Superstitions in the Highlands, by A Constant Reader. A proposal by a writer in the Orthodox Journal, that all the Papists in Britain and Ireland emigrate to Spain.....	185
LXXV. The subject of Purgatory introduced. Purgatory bridge. Extract from the Douay Catechism. Remarks thereon. Extract from "The Grounds of Catholic Doctrine, by Pope Pius IV." from Gother's Papist Misrepresented and Represented. Decree concerning Purgatory, by the Council of Trent. The sin that shall not be forgiven, &c. furnishes no argument in favour of Purgatory	198
LXXVI. Purgatory continued. Not a place where sins are remitted, but where they are punished. Purgatory a doctrine of great antiquity. Derived from ancient heathens. Short history of it. Doctrine of Christ contrasted with the Popish Purgatory.....	201
LXXVII. Purgatory continued. Purgatorian Society in Dublin, from the Rev. James Carlisle's pamphlet. Mr. Carlisle's remarks thereon. A similar Society in London. Curious particulars relating to Purgatory, from Mr. Gavin's Master Key to Popery	209
LXXVIII. Purgatory continued. Use of the different apartments in it. Anecdote of the King of Spain. Souls delivered out of Purgatory appear in the likeness of crabs, dressed in black velvet. Souls in purgatory appear as lights flitting about graves. The	

late Queen of Spain lying in state at Rome. Money bequeathed in Ireland for masses.....	217
LXXXIX. The subject of Purgatory taken up more seriously. No evidence of it in the Bible. Scriptures adduced by Papists in support of the doctrine, shown to have no bearing upon the subject. Proof from Apocryphal books considered.....	225
LXXX. Purgatory continued. Canting the corpse, as practised in Ireland, in order to obtain money to relieve the soul from Purgatory, in a letter to THE PROTESTANT. Society of St. John, in Dublin. Account of the demise of the notorious CATHOLIC VINDICATOR.....	233
LXXXI. A new bull of the Pope against the Bible and Bible schools. Letter from the Rev. Mr. Graham, with part of his translation of Buchanan's Franciscan. Remarks on the said bull, and the Popish Archbishop of Tuam's letter to his clergy. Extract from a Report of the Hibernian Society	241
LXXXII. Charge by Dr. Kelly, Popish Archbishop of Tuam, addressed to his clergy, against schools and the Bible. Remarks thereon. Irish Papists' appeal to the Pope against their own government. Exposure of their falsehood and impudence, by Mr. Thorpe	249
LXXXIII. The Popish Archbishop of Tuam's letter further discussed. Extract from the Rev. Mr. Thorpe's pamphlet. Lawfulness of tampering with persons living in ignorance and error, in order to gain them to the knowledge of the truth.....	257
LXXXIV. Further remarks on Dr. Kelly's letter. Irish Papists' abuse of the British government, and of their own advocates. Mystery of iniquity, and the mystery of holiness, contrasted, by Dr. Kelly. Influence over the people claimed by Popish priests.	265
LXXXV. Letter to THE PROTESTANT, by a Papist. Remarks thereon. Letter by a gentleman in Ireland to THE PROTESTANT. General remarks with regard to the manner in which Popery is treated by lukewarm Protestants.....	273
LXXXVI. Auricular confession introduced. Another extract from the Rev. Mr. Graham's translation of the Franciscan. Short notice of penance. The duty of auricular confession, according to Gother. Venial sins. Impiety of the doctrine.....	281
LXXXVII. Auricular confession. Capital sins, and sins which are not capital or mortal. According to the Jesuits, there is scarcely any sin mortal. Pascal's representation of their errors and impieties on this subject.....	289
LXXXVIII. The doctrine of the Jesuits relieves men from the obligation of loving their neighbours, as well as from the obligation of loving God. The immoral tendency of their doctrine shown in a number of particulars.....	297
LXXXIX. Letter of the Rev. Patrick Bradley, a Presbyterian minister, giving an account of his conversion from Popery.....	305
XC. Continuation of Mr. Bradley's Letter. Auricular confession resumed. Instructions and devotions for confession, from the Garden of the Soul.....	313
XCI. Good resolutions. Vanity of them. Method of confession; from the Garden of the Soul. The divine revelation of mercy, for the salvation of sinners, according to the Scriptures. The only way of salvation revealed to men from the beginning of the world	321
XCII. The pernicious effects of auricular confession upon the minds of priests. Account of Mr. Gordon, a Scotch gentleman, converted from Popery. His testimony of the wickedness of priests, in the matter of confession. Testimony of Gavin, a Spaniard,	

converted from Popery, to the same effect. Children's Confession turned into a farce.....	329
XCIII. Testimony of Da Costa, a Portuguese Gentleman, of the wickedness connected with confession. Bull of Pope Paul IV. against <i>Solicitants</i> . Horrible exposure of the wickedness of priests, which this occasioned. Consideration of the passages of Scripture adduced in favour of auricular confession.....	337
XCIV. The Popish doctrine, with regard to satisfaction for sin, exposed. Extract from Gother, and remarks upon it. To satisfy Divine justice required a sacrifice of infinite value.....	345
XCV. Another letter from a Papist, with remarks upon it. Dr. Copinger's Address to the Popish clergy of his diocese.....	353
XCVI. Resolutions by the Popish clergy of Cloyne and Ross, against the reading of the Bible in schools. Remarks thereon. Counsellor O'Connell's speech against the use of the Bible in schools. Remarks thereon.....	361
XCVII. The subject continued, with remarks on Bishop Copinger's Address. Examples of absurd interpretation of Scripture, by Popish divines. Note, by a correspondent, relating to the worship of each person in the blessed Trinity.....	369
XCVIII. Further remarks on O'Connell's speech against the use of the Bible in schools. Letters to THE PROTESTANT, on this subject, by an Irishman, and by J. S.....	377
XCIX. Letter to THE PROTESTANT, on the subject of Peter's supremacy. Critique on the words, "Thou art Peter," &c. Mat. xvi. 18. General exposure of the pretended supremacy of the Pope	385
C. Peter's supremacy farther discussed. No evidence of his being appointed president or head of the apostolic college, or prince of the apostles. To whom did Christ commit the keys of the kingdom of heaven?.....	393
CI. The subject continued. Table of St. Peter, by the Rhemish translators. No evidence of Peter ever having been at Rome. Was not Bishop of Rome. No certainty with regard to the place or manner of his death.....	401
CII. The subject continued. Answers to Bishop Hay's arguments for Peter's supremacy. The Catholic or universal church of Christ, has no visible head on earth. The claim of the Pope to supremacy obstructs the conversion of Mahometan and heathen princes, from Lord Clarendon's "Religion and Policy." Peter's supposed successors, from Dupin.....	409
CIII. Absurdity of the Pope pretending to derive his dignity from Peter. Strange conceit of Papists, about the state of the church in Rome, in primitive times. Extract from Lord Clarendon, showing that there is nothing certainly known of the first ages of the church, except what we have in the New Testament. No evidence of the church or bishop of Rome exercising jurisdiction over other churches. The idolatry of Pope Marcellinus. The emperor becomes Christian, and gives the Pope a rich crown. Remarks thereon.....	417
CIV. The Popes increase their power. Pope Gregory the Great. He condemns the title of universal bishop. Treason of Phocas countenanced by Pope Gregory. Phocas procures the title of universal bishop to be transferred from the Patriarch of Constantinople to the Pope of Rome. The Pope, by the help of king Pepin of France, becomes a temporal prince.....	425

THE

Protestant,

No. LI.

SATURDAY, JULY 3d, 1819.

ON entering upon a second volume, I may be permitted to take a short retrospect of what is past, and to glance at what may be expected to follow. I find that I am engaged in a greater undertaking than I at first contemplated. Originally, I had no object in view but to expose the misrepresentation contained in a single paragraph in the Glasgow Chronicle, supposed to be written by one of our Papists. The defence of that paragraph by two writers of the Romish communion, led me to enter more fully into the subject than I at first intended; and the attack made by one of them upon the principles of the Reformation, and the character of the Reformers, determined me to devote a part of my time to the investigation of a subject, which I considered of great importance, and which I knew to have been much neglected by all classes of the community for the last thirty years.

I thought I would be able to accomplish my object in the course of a few months, by a series of weekly Papers; and I touched at first but slightly on certain prominent parts of the Popish system, having, at the time, little more in view than to expose the errors and misrepresentations of my Newspaper antagonists. This will account for the very cursory manner in which I passed over some very important matters, such as the doctrine of transubstantiation, the supremacy of Peter, the term Catholic, as claimed by the Church of Rome; and the bloody wars and persecutions which have been excited by that church, within the last fifteen hundred years.

Finding, from the high degree of approbation with which my Papers were received, that the public were willing to receive such

information on the subject as I was able to give, I formed the idea of taking a more extensive range; and of writing a treatise on every one of the points by which the Church of Rome is distinguished from the true Church of Christ. I have not yet discussed more than four of these points; namely, church discipline, commencing with my nineteenth Number; the lawfulness of breaking faith with heretics, commencing with my twenty-fourth, withholding the Scriptures from the people, which is discussed in Numbers thirty to thirty-eight inclusive; and the idolatry of the Romish Church, which I have not yet finished. While discussing the first of these four points, *THE CATHOLIC VINDICATOR* made his appearance; and, as he seemed to attach to my work the importance of a national concern, I was induced to enter still more fully into the subjects of difference between the Church of Rome and the Reformed.

The subjects slightly touched upon in my earlier Numbers will probably come again under review; and besides these, there are some which I have not yet touched upon at all, which will furnish matter, I hope, for a volume at least as large as the first. These are, the idolatry of the mass, Purgatory, prayers for the dead, auricular confession, clerical celibacy, extreme unction, cruelty of the Inquisition, villany of the Jesuits, &c. &c. together with doctrinal errors, such as justification by works, merits of saints, works of supererogation, &c. &c. When I have gone over these subjects, which I do not promise to do in the order here enumerated, I will, *Deo volente*, take some notice of *THE CATHOLIC VINDICATOR*; and prove, from his writings, that the very worst features of Popery are exhibited to view in the present day; I shall endeavour to vindicate our Reformers from the aspersions of this writer, and *AMICUS VERITATIS*; and last of all, as of least importance, I shall vindicate myself and my writings from the numerous misrepresentations of *THE CATHOLIC VINDICATOR*.

There is one thing which I desire not to lose sight of, and which I wish my readers to keep always in remembrance; it is, that the foundation of the controversy lies deeper than any thing that meets the eye in the external fooleries and superstitions of the Church of Rome. The grand fundamental question at issue is no less than, Who is the Saviour of sinners? I call the Church of Rome the Antichrist, because she is opposed to Christ on this fundamental point. There is no truth more clearly revealed in the word of God, than that Christ alone is the Saviour; that our salvation is entirely of him, without the assistance or co-operation of any creature whatever; that our justification before God proceeds entirely upon the ground of his merit, or, what is a more expressive word, his righteousness, to the absolute exclu-

sion of all merit or righteousness whatever on the part of creatures. This is so distinctly laid down in the holy Scriptures, especially in Paul's Epistles to the Romans and Galatians, that I hold it as a first principle of divine revelation, that Christ is to a sinner, a whole Saviour, or he is not his Saviour at all; that if we do not trust in him *alone* for salvation, we do not trust in him at all; and that if a sinner put the smallest degree of trust in any thing else, be it what it may, though he should still profess to put greater trust in Christ, he is in fact completely turned away from Christ, and he is making a saviour of that something else in which he places his little trust.

Now Papists openly and avowedly trust, at least in part, in their own merit, and the merit of saints; and though they profess also to trust in Christ, or perhaps to put greater trust in him, yet they do most effectually renounce him, by dividing their confidence between him, and themselves, and other creatures. What Papists consider their own merit, consists in some fancied conformity to the whole, or to some part of the divine law. Now the Apostle tells us plainly, that if righteousness come by the law, then Christ is dead in vain, Gal. ii. 21.; a most horrible supposition; but it is realized in the mind of every man who expects to contribute in the smallest degree to his own salvation, by his obedience to the law, that is, by his fancied righteousness; and the same Apostle tells us, Gal. v. 4. that whosoever is justified by the law, he is fallen from grace. The very attempt to seek justification in this way, is to renounce Jesus Christ as the Saviour, and to make a saviour of their own merit; and hence it is that I maintain that my controversy with the Papists involves no less than this fundamental question,—Who is the Saviour of sinners?

I do not intend to enter at present upon a discussion of this subject, but I allude to it, in order to remind my readers of what I consider the root and origin of all the errors of Popery. It is the self-righteous bias of the human heart, and its deep-rooted hatred of the grace of the gospel. From this proceeds all the idolatry which I have been describing, and intend yet farther to describe; for creature confidence leads as naturally to creature worship, as confidence in God leads to worship him: and though we could persuade Papists to give up transubstantiation, and all their mummery and nonsense, they would stand upon no better footing with regard to a future life, unless they gave up also their fundamental doctrine of human merit,* and were led to trust in that of Christ alone for the salvation of their souls.

* The following epitaph is inscribed upon a monument in one of their chapels, in the city of Cork:—"I. H. S. Sacred to the memory of the

It was the glory of the Reformation and of the Reformers, that notwithstanding their imperfections and mistakes on some points of order and discipline, they clearly apprehended, and publicly taught, the doctrine of justification by faith alone, upon the footing of Christ's perfect righteousness; that is, that men are justified and saved not by what they have done, or can do, but by what Christ has done and suffered in their stead; and that they become interested in this by faith; that is, by believing the testimony of God in the Scriptures concerning his Son. On this point Luther, and Calvin, and other leaders of the Reformation, were entirely of one mind, though they differed on some subordinate articles; and the German Reformer had such a deep conviction of the fundamental importance of this truth, that he called it the article, by holding or rejecting which, a church would stand or fall. It was some time before Luther could reconcile the doctrine so clearly taught by Paul, with that of James in his Epistle, which led him to doubt the divine inspiration of the latter; but as his mind opened to the understanding of divine truth, he perceived, what every Christian peasant now perceives, that the doctrine of the one Apostle is perfectly consistent with that of the other.

But the Scripture doctrine respecting justification, or, which is the same thing, the way by which alone a sinner can be saved, is absolutely unintelligible to our Papists. They will rather go without salvation than accept of it in the way of divine appointment. Like the Jews, in the days of the Apostles, they will not submit to the righteousness of God; that is, they will not receive salvation as a free gift through the righteousness of Christ; and their masses, their pilgrimages, their penances, are nothing else than a going about to establish their own righteousness, as the Jews did by their ceremonial observances.

Now it is a great mistake to speak of this as if it were merely one of the many modifications of the Christian religion; for, besides the error of representing the Christian religion as having many modifications, which it has not, the system of seeking salvation by human merit, is not only not of Christianity, but is absolutely inconsistent with it. It has no more to do with the religion of Christ, than darkness has with light; than the service of Baal with that of the true God.

benevolent Edward Molloy, the friend of humanity, and father of the poor; he employed the wealth of this world only to secure the riches of the next; and leaving a balance of merit on the book of life, he made heaven debtor to mercy. He died 17th Oct., 1818, aged 90. R. I. P.' *Philanthropic Gazette*, June 16th, 1819. This is the Popery of the 19th century. The Editor justly condemns the daring impiety of making the Creator debtor to his creature; but this is inseparable from the doctrine of human merit.

I know it is fashionable in certain Protestant circles to speak of Rome as a true church, nay, as the mother church, from which it was, indeed, lawful to separate, on account of her many corruptions. Nay, if the public journals give a fair report of the speeches of some of our senators on a late discussion of what are called the Catholic claims, it was distinctly maintained, that, unless the religion of Rome were admitted to be a true religion, we could not maintain the truth of our own. It is the design of my present remarks, to show that this is a great and a dangerous error. If our own religion be, that we can contribute to our own salvation by our own merit, then, indeed, it is the same as that of Rome; but if our religion be that which Christ and his Apostles taught,—“By grace are ye saved through faith, and that not of yourselves, it is the gift of God; not of works, lest any man should boast,” Eph. ii. 8, 9.; then our religion is not the same, but the very opposite of that of Rome. It is the very opposite, not merely in modes of worship, and subordinate points of doctrine; it is radically and fundamentally another religion; and that of Rome is as much opposed to that of Christ, as any system of heathen idolatry practised in ancient or modern times.

It is time to have done with that spurious liberality that confounds right and wrong, in matters of divine revelation. Let not our Protestant population, especially let not our Protestant senators, halt between two opinions. If Baal be God, serve him. If Popery be Christianity, let them go over to it. If it be not Christianity, let it be regarded as it ought, as a system of delusion, invented by the Devil, for the purpose of counteracting and opposing the religion of Christ, which gives the most glorious display of divine mercy for the recovery of a ruined world.

One main argument which Papists use to show that theirs is the true religion, is, that if it were not so, God would not have allowed it to prevail so extensively, and to continue so long; and this argument has some weight with our Protestant politicians. They suppose that surely that must be Christianity, which alone appeared in the world as such, for more than a thousand years; and they are seduced by the vague use of the word Christendom, a term which will be found to have no meaning, if we attempt to explain it upon Christian principles.

But there is a fallacy in the argument, which might be detected by any child who reads his Bible. How does it appear that God would not suffer a system of error to prevail extensively, and continue for hundreds of years? Has he ever promised to force the human mind, so that those who love error shall not be allowed to embrace it? Certainly there is no promise to this effect in the word of God; but there is a threatening that the

very contrary shall take place. "This is the condemnation, that light is come into the world; and men loved darkness rather than light, because their deeds are evil." John iii. 19. The light of the gospel shone in Rome for a time, as well as in many other places. The first believers there were distinguished for the steadfastness of their faith, which was spoken of throughout the whole world. Rom. i. 8. These were either murdered by their heathen persecutors, or died a natural death. The same happened to their immediate successors; and, after two or three generations, the Christians in Rome, like those in other places, began to depart from the faith and the holy practice of their fathers. This arose from the corrupt bias of their hearts. It was because they loved darkness rather than the light. They made their choice of error, and God left them to the influence of that which they had chosen. Now this is precisely what he said he would do in such a case, and what he would do to the Church of Rome, for it is evident that the passage applies to her almost as clearly as if she had been mentioned by name:—"Let no man deceive you by any means: for that day" (the day of Christ's second coming) "shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition; who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he as God, sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God. Remember ye not that while I was yet with you, I told you these things? And now ye know what withholdeth, that he might be revealed in his time. For the mystery of iniquity doth already work; only he that now letteth (or preventeth) will prevent, until he be taken out of the way:"—that is, the Pagan imperial power must be removed, ere the papal antichristian power can be established. "And then shall that Wicked be revealed, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the brightness of his coming: Even him whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all power, and signs, and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness in them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth that they might be saved. And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie; that they all might be condemned who believe not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness." 2 Thess. ii. 3—12. They were first guilty of the wickedness of not receiving the love of the truth. The expression implies positive hatred of the truth; that is, of the gospel. It was a positive dislike of God's method of salvation by Christ alone, without regard to merit on their part. This is the most heinous wickedness; but having chosen this fatal error and refusing to be reclaimed, God inflicted the righteous punish-

ment of leaving them to the influence of the father of lies, who seduced them to believe one delusion after another, till he brought the Church of Rome to that monstrous height of wickedness which she exhibited to enslaved Europe, at the period of the Reformation; and which she still exhibits in every country in which the spirit of delusion has room to operate at his pleasure.

Thus we see, that instead of promising security against such an apostacy as that which is justly ascribed to the Church of Rome, it was declared by the inspired Apostle, that such should be the consequence of certain errors which began to be broached in his own time, but which were more extensively propagated after the death of all the Apostles; which soon affected all the churches, and prepared the way for that man of sin, and son of perdition, who established his dominion, not only over the churches, but also over the kings of the earth.

The fallacy of the argument, if argument it may be called, may be shown in another way. It is urged, that if the Romish religion were not the true one, God would not have suffered it to prevail so extensively, and continue so long. But the same argument will apply to the religion of Mahomet, which has existed nearly as long, and been as widely diffused as that of Rome. I believe there are more Mahometans than Papists in the world; and though Popery appeared a little sooner, the two systems were perfected nearly about the same time. A Mussulman, therefore, may argue, that if my religion were not the true one, it would not have been so extensively propagated, or so long maintained in the world.

But both must give way to pure heathenism. She has a better claim to antiquity and universality, than either Mahomet or the Pope. These are mere upstarts in comparison of Fohi and Zoroaster, and the other fathers of Pagan worship; and as for the number of their adherents, I am persuaded Rome cannot muster one to ten of the heathen. Rome boasts of holding the catholic, or universal religion; and she holds forth this as a proof of her being the true church; but heathenism has ten times a better right to the term catholic; because it was for many ages the religion of the whole world, with the exception of a small country, not so large as Scotland; and because it is at this day the religion of at least three-fourths of the human race. A heathen, therefore, might use the argument which I am combating, with much more force than any one else:—‘If my religion were not the true one, God would not have suffered it to prevail over the whole world, and continue for four or five thousand years.’ Our modern Papists, and their Protestant advocates, will, I hope, answer this heathen argument, before they again attempt to defend Popery on the ground of its antiquity and universality

I shall ascend a step higher, in order to expose the folly of this Popish argument. It is known that the whole world lieth in wickedness. All flesh hath corrupted its way. Wickedness prevails universally in the earth, and has done so ever since there was a race of men upon it. The sect of sinners, if I may use the expression, is more ancient than even heathenism, and also more extensive, as they are to be found in every other sect, not excepting the Protestant part of the world. If, therefore, antiquity and universality will prove the truth of a system, the wicked of all nations and sects have a better plea than the Church of Rome.

It will be replied, that Christ has promised to preserve his church from fatal error, and final apostacy; that he has given no such promise to Mahometans or heathens; and therefore that his church having this promise, can appeal to it, as well as to the fact of her existence for many ages, in proof of her divine origin. It is true, Christ has promised to preserve *his* church, and to be present with her to the end of the world; but this is not the Church of Rome, nor the church of any other city or nation, nor all the churches in the world put together, unless they hold by Christ as the Head, and do what he has commanded. Any company, however great, or however small, is his church, if they hold fast the confidence, (or faith in him,) and the rejoicing of the hope firm unto the end, Heb. iii. 6, 14.

There is a promise, that Christ shall have a seed to serve him in all generations. These he will keep by his mighty power through faith unto salvation. But there is no promise of perpetuity to the Church of Rome, or any other church known by an earthly name. Nay, we know in point of fact, that churches which were planted by Apostles, and favoured by their personal ministry, have perished from the earth; and we find in the New Testament, that the standing of any church is connected with their holding the faith of the gospel, which, if they let go, Christ will fulfil his word by leaving them to all the consequences of their apostacy. It was to the Church in Rome that the Apostle Paul said, "Thou standest by faith; be not high-minded, but fear; for if God spared not the natural branches (the church of the Jews), take heed lest he also spare not thee." Rome did become high-minded, and has been long, not only cut off from the spiritual body of Christ, but has actually become the enemy of Christ, and has a name given her by divine authority, "Mystery, Babylon, the mother of harlots, and abominations of the earth."

Having occupied this entire Number with introductory matter, I shall proceed, in my next, to that branch of Popish idolatry that consists in worshipping relics.

THE

Protestant,

No. LII.

SATURDAY, JULY 10th, 1819.

THE PROTESTANT has not the privilege of being, like the man with the short face who wrote the Spectator, entirely unknown by person. He has, however, sometimes been placed in situations in which he could hear what people said of him, without being known to be present. He was much gratified one evening, in the shop of his publishers, by hearing a decent looking man tell the shopman, that he was so much taken with THE PROTESTANT, that he had given up the use of tobacco that he might be able to buy it, for he could not afford to indulge himself with both.

On entering into conversation with this man, I found he was well acquainted both with Popery and Papists; and to use his own expression, he was "unco chief wi' some o' them." He told me that one day he looked into their chapel in a neighbouring town, which had recently been opened; that the Beadle very kindly showed him all the excellences of the *sacred* building; and feeling, no doubt, the importance attached to his own person, while he had the charge of the *holy place*, he said "We have all things very complete here, except one thing which we want, that is relics,—we have no relics." This officer, no doubt, spoke the mind of his superiors; and from this we learn the important truth, that relics are considered necessary to the completeness, or perfection, of a Popish chapel. How near Mr. Scott has brought his to perfection I cannot tell.

By relics we are to understand certain remains of the bodies, or of the dress or furniture of persons who were renowned in

their day; and also of some who were renowned only after their death. It is not easy to define the precise degree of worship which devout Papists give to relics. The objects themselves are so multifarious, and the degree of value which is attached to each, depends so much upon the fancy of the worshipper, that it can scarcely be reduced to a system. As my friend Mr. M'Culloch observes, "a great deal must be left to the judgment of the simple faithful. Thus, for example," says he, "there must be some difference in the worship offered to the pairings of St Edmund's toes, and that given to the coals which roasted St Laurence, or to the stones preserved among the Glastonbury relics, as the identical stones which the Devil tempted Christ to turn into bread. Some we know are to receive divine worship, for, says Aquinas, 'if we speak of the very cross upon which Christ was crucified, it is to be worshipped with divine worship; both as it represents Christ, and touched the members of his body, and was sprinkled with his blood: And for these reasons, we both speak to the cross, and pray to it, as if it were Christ crucified upon it.' *P. 3. Qu. 25. Art. 4.* But others, intended merely to terrify the witches, cure the diseases of cattle, kill vermin, and serve other little necessary purposes, must receive a veneration suited to the nature of their uses." *Page 368.*

There is no part of Popery that depends so much upon downright lying and imposition, as that upon which I am now entering; and there is no part of the system that gives such an humbling view of the beastly prostration of human intellect. When the prophet Ezekiel saw in vision, (chap. viii.) the idolatrous Jews worshipping "every form of creeping things, and abominable beasts, and all the idols of the house of Israel," he saw little more than what is practised every day in Popish countries, where the wretched and deluded people pay their devotions to rotten rags, to the decayed bones of human carcasses, and to all manner of nastiness, the very mention of which would fill with loathing the mind of every human being that is not brutified by an abominable superstition.

I have before me a catalogue of some hundreds of relics, which are objects of Popish devotion in several churches, in France, Spain, and Italy. Many of them are too gross to appear in a modern publication, though the Editors of a periodical work (*The Philosophical Library*), have lately polluted some pages of very fine paper, by inserting several articles, which, for decency's sake, they might have omitted. The least offensive, are the arms, fingers, legs, and toes of certain saints; and some of them must have had as many limbs as a centipede; for in Flanders, Spain, and France, there are no fewer than eight arms of St Matthew, which would of course produce forty fingers, and

these would enrich as many churches. The author of one catalogue in my possession, assures his readers, that he himself had seen three arms of St. Luke; and he could not tell how many St. Thomas à Becket had.

Such relics are considered the treasure of the churches to which they belong; and in fact they bring no small gain to the church, as great sums are received annually from devout pilgrims, who come hundreds of miles to feast their eyes and warm their devotion by looking upon those limbs, which would have been more honoured by being allowed to rest quietly in the earth.

They have, however, many things besides fragments of human bodies; and some articles are of great antiquity, which one would think could not possibly be in existence, or find their way into what is called Christendom; but when the Pope has said that they are what they are called, the simple faithful have nothing to do or say, but to believe what they are told. For instance, they have in the church of Lateran, in Rome, the Ark of the Lord which Moses made in the wilderness, together with the rod of Moses; and they profess to show in the same church, the identical table on which our Lord ate the last supper with his disciples. Though this table is shown entire in Rome, there are pieces of it in both Spain and Flanders. I suppose no Papist doubts that a thing may be entirely in one place, and partly, or even wholly, in another at the same time. For instance, they believe that the whole body of Christ is in every place where the mass is celebrated, and in every particle of every consecrated wafer, though it were broken into a thousand pieces, and scattered to the winds. There is, therefore, nothing incredible in the story of the miraculous table, which has done many wonderful things, if we may believe the Jesuits.

Upon the high altar in the said Lateran church, there stand the heads of the Apostles Peter and Paul; and whenever these are shown to the people, there are so many pardons and indulgences granted. Though the heads be in Rome, there is a great piece of the skull of Peter in the possession of the Augustines in Bilboa, and of that of Paul in the possession of the Franciscans in the same city; and I believe Peter has an entire head somewhere else.

It is by no means my intention to disgust my readers with a complete catalogue of the trumpery in which the wealth of many a church consists. I shall merely mention a few of the most harmless, and then proceed to describe the use which is made of them. The Augustine friars in Burgos are said to have the Virgin Mary's chamber-pot, which they regard as a very precious relic; but whether they honour it with hyperdulia, that is, the same degree of adoration as they give to the Virgin herself, I

cannot say. In St. Peter's church they have the cross of the good thief, somewhat worm-eaten; Judas's lantern, a little scorched; the dice the soldiers played with, when they cast lots for our Saviour's garment; the tail of Balaam's ass; St. Joseph's axe, saw, and hammer, and a few nails he had not driven; St. Anthony's mill-stone, on which he sailed to Muscovy. These are taken from a catalogue dated 1753; and I presume the articles remain there still, though I cannot prove the fact. The same catalogue contains the following, among hundreds more, which enrich different churches; part of the wood of the cross, a little decayed; and a nail of the same. There are said to be as many pieces of the timber of the true cross in different parts of Europe, as would supply a town with fuel for a winter. Part of the manna in the wilderness; and some blossoms of Aaron's rod. The arm of St. Simeon, ill kept. The image of the blessed Virgin drawn by St. Luke, the features all visible; one of her combs; and twelve combs of the twelve Apostles all very little used. Some relics of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. The arm and some part of the body of Lazarus; ill kept, and smells. A part of the body of St. Mark; and a part of his Gospel, of his own hand-writing, almost legible. A finger and an arm of St. Ann, the blessed Virgin's mother. A piece of the Virgin's veil, as good as new. The staff delivered by our Lord to St. Patrick, with which he drove all the venomous creatures out of Ireland. Some of St. Joseph's breath, which an angel inclosed in a phial, as he was cleaving wood violently; which was so long adored in France, and since brought to Venice, and from Venice to Rome. The head of St. Dennis, which he carried two miles, after it was cut off, under his arm, from Montmartre to St. Dennis. A piece of the rope Judas hanged himself with. Large parcels of the blessed Virgin's hair. Great quantities of her milk; some butter, and a small cheese made of it, which never decays, &c. &c. *Phil. Lib., June, 1818.*

These precious relics are solemnly certified to be what they are said to be; and many of them have proved themselves genuine by most stupendous miracles; all which is piously believed by their devout worshippers. I appeal to every man of common sense, whether he can imagine a system of more palpable and abominable falsehood than that which is here exhibited? It is impossible that any one of the articles which I have enumerated can be verified or proved to be what it is called. There is not one of them entitled even to the credit of probability, few of them to that of possibility; and yet the priests of the churches in which they are deposited, will assert their authenticity with more confidence than they will maintain any article of divine revelation and the Pope himself is not ashamed to lend the sanction of his

pretended divine authority to support and recommend the imposture.

The great matter with the Pope, and his army of priests, is, to get the poor deluded people to believe that some miraculous virtue resides in the relics which, on certain occasions, are exhibited to their view; to get them to come and pay their devotions to these relics, and pay their money for the sight of them; for, as I have often said, and proved, there is no blessing to be had from the Church of Rome without money.

After all, to let my readers into a secret, it is not necessary that the bones which are actually worshipped as the relics of any particular saint, should really have belonged to that saint. It is enough that the worshipper has an intention of honouring the saint whose bones he supposes them to be; and though they should not be really his, yet if they were dug out of the ground in which he was buried, all the merit which his body possessed is communicated to them. I quote the following from a work entitled, "Observations on a Journey to Naples." It is by the author of "The Frauds of Romish Monks and Priests," who was himself, at one time, a good Papist, and who relates what he knew from personal observation.

"To speak the truth, these are the very reasonings which the gentlemen of Rome, I mean the Pope and cardinals, make use of every day, with regard to the holy bodies which they fetch out of the catacombs, and which they send so boldly, and so frequently, to places of their communion to be worshipped there. These catacombs, in the sense they take them in, are subterranean places, where believers assembled themselves in the times of persecution, and where they buried the corpses of their martyrs; but they also indifferently buried there the bodies of all Christians; so that as these places served them for temples, or places to meet in, so they served them also as church-yards to bury their dead. The Popes having, in these last ages, taken into mature consideration, the great gain they reaped from the bones of their saints, had recourse to these places, as to inexhaustible mines, and indifferently seized all the bones they met with there. Yea, their avarice lasted out to that degree, that either not knowing, or not being able to distinguish, the true catacombs, they have gone to search for dead bodies in the common sewers, or subterranean vaults, which were the sinks to carry off the filth of the city, and where, in ancient times, they were used to fling the bodies of malefactors, after their execution. True it is, that amongst them were found the bodies of martyrs, which escaped the knowledge of Christians. The Popes not having the power to distinguish the one from the other, and to spare themselves a trouble, which besides would have been

pure labour lost, by the power of God himself, which they professed themselves to have, metamorphosed them all, *dictum factum*, into saints. The heathens had also caves and vaults, where they caused themselves to be interred with their whole families; and the greatest part of all these bones are now upon the altars of the Papists, under the name of saints, taken up out of the catacombs. And forasmuch as the Popes are ignorant of their names, they baptize them anew, and give them a name as best pleaseth them, which is the cause of so many contests and trials between the priests and the monks, who all pretend, in good time, to be the sole possessors of the primitive saint, of this or the other name. These trials are to be determined at Rome, by means of money, which still inflames the Popes with a greater zeal to send as many as they can of these saints into all parts, which one day or other will not fail to furnish them with matter for trials so gainful to them; yea, we may affirm, that there be almost as many trials at Rome, about relics, as about beneficial matters. Now the doctrine which serves to quiet the consciences of the Romanists, from the checks that might torment them, for having exposed, and still daily exposing, such abominable filthinesses upon their altars, is this, that they believe that what St. Paul saith, that the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the believing husband, ought also to be understood of their relics, forasmuch as all the bones, which are found in one vault, are sanctified by their neighbourhood with those of one saint. Or at least, if this wont do, they betake themselves to their last shift, which is this, that a good intention is an abundant excuse for all these petty irregularities in those who continue in the bosom of the Church of Rome; so that is enough, according to them, to have a right intention of honouring such a he saint, or she saint, and to receive with reverence and obedience the instruments proposed to them, for to honour them.

“Now the use that the priests and monks of the Church of Rome do make of these principles, is this, that there are no bones whatsoever, no, not the bones of an ass, or horse, but they may make relics of them; they need only break a piece of them, and tell you that it is a relic of one of the eleven thousand virgins that suffered martyrdom at Collen, or else one of the soldiers of the Theban legion, who were all cut in pieces at the passage of the Alps, for refusing to sacrifice to Mars, the traveller. They may show you the rib of a sucking pig, and tell you it is a relic of one of the little innocents, who were massacred at our Saviour's birth; or, lastly, tell you that it is the bone of a saint taken out of the catacombs.”

“I was once in the Abbey of the Trinity at Vandome, in France, when they exposed their treasury of relics. They showed

us among other things, a jaw-bone, which the monks told us was that of St. Magdalene; and a very able physician, who was present at the same time, was ready to maintain to their face, and would forfeit his head, if he did not prove to them, by the texture, scaling, and largeness of the bone, that it never belonged to a human body, but it was a piece of the jaw-bone of some beast or other. But the fathers were so far from desiring him to disabuse them in the case, that they presently pop'd up another relic, to put him by his displeasing discourse. This relic was that they call the holy tear, which is so famous in that country. The tradition they pretend to have concerning it runs thus, that when our Saviour wept over Lazarus, an angel gathered up his tears, in a small chrystal phial, and that having preserved them a long time, he gave them to St. Mary Magdalene, who was then doing penance at a place which is called *La Sainte Baume*, near to Marseilles; that, in process of time, this relic was carried to Constantinople, where it continued during the reign of the Greek emperor; and being afterwards fallen, together with all the riches of that great city, into the hands of the Turks, a Turkish Emperor presented it to Godfrey, Earl of Vendome, who deposited it in this Abbey. It seems by this tradition, that it took many turns before it came thither, and above all, that which I consider is, that it passed through the hands of infidels and enemies to the name of Christ. But for all this the Roman Catholics, and, above all, the monks of that Abbey, have not the least doubt or scruple concerning it; but bestow upon it the worship of *latria*, even the same they give to Jesus Christ himself." "We viewed this chrystal very attentively, holding it up against the light, and afterwards took a view of it at the light of a wax taper, but we could discover nothing of what they were pleased to tell us. They have recourse to this relic in all maladies of the eyes, and upon this account, it brings a vast income to these fathers.

"If all the false relics, which at present are adored in the Church of Rome, had voices and could speak, what strange stories should we hear! Some would say, we are the bones of heathens, or of malefactors; others of horses, asses, dogs, &c. And yet I question, after all this, if they would quit them. They would say, "It is like that these voices were only the illusions and artifices of the devil, who is envious at the glory that is bestowed on the saints; and that their church being infallible, having proposed these relics to believers to be worshipped, she can neither err in matter of right, or in matter of fact.

"Many English Roman Catholics cannot endure to hear that they bestow adorations upon things that are so very vile, and contemptible; but it is only by reason of their ignorance of what passeth in those countries where Popery is rampant; for there

may be seen things yet far more ridiculous, such as the lantern of Judas ; a shoe of St. Joseph ; hair, parings of nails, and all manner of excrements of their saints and saintesses. The treasures of their churches are top filled with these kinds of precious relics, and Protestant travellers may make themselves very merry in Italy, if they will give themselves the leisure to go and see the treasures which are kept in their churches, and more especially in the country, where the capuchins, and other mendicants, take care to have great store of them. At least, they may be sure to find there, those implements the Papists call *Agnus Dei*, and almost in every parish one of St. Margaret's girdles. The *Agnus Dei's* are pieces of white wax, upon which is imprinted the figure of a little lamb, carrying a cross upon his shoulder. The Popes bless them in holy week, at Rome, with great ceremony, in memory of the words which St. John the Baptist said of our Saviour, ' Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sins of the world.' They believe, therefore, conformably to this, that these *Agnus Dei's* do forgive sins ; at least those that are not very heinous ones indeed ; and they almost pay as great respect to them as they do to the host itself. They carry them in procession, they kneel before them, they pray to them. Secular persons may not touch them with their fingers, they must be priests, or monks, or nuns, to whom the bishop gives this permission and privilege. The nuns make it a great part of their employment to make inclosures of silk for them, very neatly wrought with a needle into all manner of figures, and then they bestow them upon such seculars as present them highest for the sanctification of their souls. And besides the remission of their sins, they are over and above very good to preserve a Roman Catholic from all the evil and accidents of this life." *Observations on a Journey to Naples; second day's Journey.*

It is an important observation of the above writer, that " many English Roman Catholics cannot endure to hear that they bestow adorations upon things that are so very vile." The fact is, Papists in England owe much to their intercourse with Protestants. They are, in consequence of this, more refined, and in some respects, more enlightened than they are aware of. They would shrink from the idea of falling down and adoring some of the articles enumerated in this sheet ; but then, instead of abandoning the church which sanctions such abominations, they impudently deny the fact of their existence. They maintain that the faith and worship of their church is the same all the world over ; and yet they would be ashamed to worship what is authorised by their religion where it reigns in all its glory.

THE

Protestant,

No. LIII.

SATURDAY, JULY 17th, 1819.

THERE are some persons who are surprised by the explicitness with which I charge lying upon Papists as a body; and who think I would do better to abstain from the use of such language. Such persons are not acquainted with the people I have to deal with, or with their writings, else they would be convinced that I could not do them justice without speaking of them as they are, in broad plain English. Papists themselves know that I do them no injustice by accusing them of lying; and they would only laugh at my simplicity if I were to affect to think otherwise of them. I refer not merely to the instances of falsehood which have come under my own observation, and which attach to individuals only, without being justly chargeable upon the general body. I speak of the system of Popery, which is built upon falsehood, is supported by falsehood, and is, in fact, nothing but fraud and falsehood throughout. I do not say that there are not individuals attached to the Church of Rome, who have a regard to truth, who would abide by it in their dealings with their neighbours, and who are therefore better than their religion; but I do not hesitate to affirm that it is impossible for any man to be an active promoter or defender of Popery, without having recourse to lying and imposition.

Their tricks and miracles are lies, every one of them. The virtue ascribed to their relics is founded on sheer lying and imposition; and when his Holiness condescends, or rather presumes, to authenticate a parcel of dry bones, found in the catacombs, or common sewers, to be relics of certain saints, it is nothing less than the Head of the Church telling lies; and what

must that Church be whose Head practises such an abominable vice ?

In my last Number, I gave some account of Popish relics, of the honour or worship which is given to them, and of the manner in which some of them were procured. I proceed now to speak of the wonderful things which they are said to have done.

“ Prince Christopher, of the family of the Dukes of Radzecil, having gone a pilgrimage to Rome, to kiss his Holiness’ toe, received, as a reward of his piety, a box of very precious relics. These, on his return home, became the consolation of the afflicted, and the terror of the devil. Even the most stubborn of those evil spirits, over whom ordinary relics possessed no influence, acknowledged their virtue in bellowings of submission.

“ Scarcely had a few months illustrated their power, when some monks, with humble entreaty, requested the use of them for the benefit of a man into whom the devil had entered. As the foul fiend stuck to his new habitation with the utmost stubbornness, and disregarded their most potent conjurations, the prince readily complied ; and no sooner were they applied to the body of the demoniac, than the devil was forced to decamp. The spectators exclaimed, A miracle ! a miracle ! and the prince lifted up his hands and heart in pious gratitude to God, for bestowing upon him such a holy and powerful treasure.

“ Some time after, when the prince was relating to his friends this wonderful deliverance, and extolling the virtues of his relics, one gentleman, who had been in his retinue at Rome, discovered uncommon incredulity. Being posed to account for his rejecting such plain evidence as attended this transaction, he told him, that, in returning from Rome, he had unluckily lost the box of relics, which had been intrusted to his care. To screen himself, therefore, from his resentment, he had provided another exactly similar, and filled it with bones and little trinkets ; and this was the identical box which had wrought such wonders.

“ Next morning, the prince sent for the monks, and asked, if they knew any other demoniac who needed his relics. A person of this description was easily found ; for the devil, in Popish countries, is particularly remarkable for his spirit of opposition, and is generally to be found nestling in the neighbourhood of relics. When the monks produced the demoniac, the prince caused him to be exorcised in his presence, but without effect. The devil kept his birth with all the obstinacy of a mule, and would neither be moved by threats nor coaxing. The prince then ordered the monks to withdraw, and delivered the demoniac to some Tartars, whom he kept about his stable, with orders to give the devil his due. At first the devil thought to terrify them by his horrible gestures and grimaces ; but these Tartars

used their whips with such faithfulness, as the devil never witnessed before. Having never dreamed of such a mode of exorcising, he found himself taken on the weak side; and, therefore, without the use of either relics, hard words, or holy water, he began to cry for quarter, and confessed that the monks had hired him to personate a character which he was ill qualified to sustain.

“The prince again requested the presence of the monks, and produced to them the man, who threw himself at his feet, and acknowledged the imposture. They at first declared this to be only an artifice of the devil, who employed the organs of this man to propagate such a falsehood, to the discredit of religion. But when the prince told them, how necessary it was to exorcise the father of lies out of them also, they began to repent, and acknowledged that they had been guilty of this imposition, with a view to stop the progress of Lutheranism, and save the souls of all good Papists in that country. He then dismissed them, at the same time telling them, that such pious frauds were mere diabolical inventions, and that he would no longer trust his salvation to men who used such means to support their religion. He accordingly began to turn his attention to the Scriptures; and, notwithstanding their obscurity, he understood as much of their meaning as showed him the absurdity of Popish principles, and induced him to make an open profession of the Reformed religion.

“The reader may perhaps be curious to know what the Pope had put into this wonderful box. But the loss of it has for ever deprived us of this important piece of information. For his satisfaction, however, I can give him an abstract of the catalogue of images and relics which formerly belonged to the cathedral of Glasgow. At the Reformation, there were treasured up there, an image of our Saviour in gold, the twelve Apostles in silver, and two silver crosses, enriched with precious stones, and small portions of the wood of the true cross. There were, likewise, five silver caskets, containing the following articles of adoration: 1. Some hair of the blessed Virgin; 2. A piece of the hairy garment worn by St. Kentigern, a part of the scourge with which he flogged himself, and a part of the scourge used by St. Thomas à Becket; 3. A piece of St. Bartholomew's skin; 4. A bone of St. Ninian; 5. A piece of the girdle worn by the Virgin Mary. In a crystal case was found a bone of St. Magdalene. There were also four crystal phials, containing a part of the Virgin Mary's milk; a piece of the manger in which Christ was laid; a red liquor which formerly flowed from the tomb of St. Kentigern; some bones of St. Eugene and St. Blaise; and a part of the tomb of St. Catherine. There were six hides containing very precious relics: such as, a piece of St.

Martin's cloak, part of the bodies of St. Kentigern and St. Thomas à Becket, &c. Two linen bags were filled with saint's bones; and a vast assemblage of small relics were lodged in a wooden chest." (*Beauties of Scotland*, vol. 3. p. 217, 218.)

"When the Reformation rendered images and relics useless in Scotland, the Archbishop of Glasgow retired to France, and carried along with him this precious treasure. With such a host of friendly intercessors, he could not fail to enjoy a cordial reception from the church. The most mortified ecclesiastic in France could scarcely behold a golden Saviour, and silver Apostles, without welcome greetings, and feeling his demure visage relaxing into smiles of complacency.

"Though I cannot at present give the reader a view of all the uses of relics in religion, there is one, which it would be doing injustice to the subject to omit. Like oral tradition, they have been found of vast use for explaining obscure passages of Scripture. Of this many edifying illustrations might be produced; but one will serve as a specimen of the whole. Five devout pilgrims, happening to meet on their return from Rome, loaded with these excellent helps to religion, each began to extol his acquisitions. After much conversation, highly characteristic of their faithful simplicity, they produced their riches; and, lo, to their great amazement, each was honoured with a foot of the very ass upon which Christ rode to Jerusalem. Now, the reader may recollect, that the Scriptures do not even tell us that this ass had a foot, but here is decisive proof of the existence of five; and if five were collected by five pilgrims only, let him conceive how many must be travelling through other parts of the church, to assist the simple faithful in their exercises of devotion. The Romish church is extremely lucky, in picking up this relic before the existence of the Antiquarian Society. The discovery of an ass with five feet would have rendered them frantic with joy, and completely marred the devotions of the whole congregation of the simple. Rather than see such a precious ass deprived of one hoof, they would permit every member of the church to remain in ignorance for ever.

"Such idle fooleries has the Church of Rome palmed upon the world, under pretence of religion. A view of their influence upon our ancestors is sufficient to show their opposition to the spirit of the gospel. In proportion as our progenitors were actuated by this gloomy superstition, we find them destitute of practical piety and every social virtue. They spent that time and property in idle pilgrimage, in hunting after relics, and other nonsensical acts of devotion, which ought to have been employed for the benefit of mankind; and multitudes at last beggared their families, to perpetuate these delusions. So prevalent was this

evil in England, that the statute of mortmain was found necessary to prevent the whole landed property of the nation from becoming the plunder of the church.

“When the Church of Rome maintains the usefulness of images and relics as means of devotion, it is merely a cloak to conceal the most selfish views.—Wherever these appendages of superstition have abounded, they have always been connected with swarms of monks, remarkable only for their vices, and for impoverishing the bigotted and the ignorant. Mistaken views of religion introduced them at first into the church; and afterwards they have been used to render mankind subservient to the gratification of the clergy. The advice given to Pope Julius III. by the Bishops assembled at Bononia, discovers the light in which the crafty ecclesiastics of the Romish church view the relics of the saints. ‘When any Bishop,’ said they, ‘sets himself to officiate in any divine service with pomp and solemnity, he ought to have many ornaments to distinguish him from ordinary priests; such as, the bones and relics of some dead man. Do you command him to hang a whole leg, arm, or head of some saint about his neck, by a good thick cord; for that will contribute very much to increase the religious astonishment of all who behold it. The truth is, these ceremonies were all invented and continued by Popes; you, therefore, who are a Pope, may, if you please, augment them.’ *M’Culloch, Pop. Cond. pp. 368, 376.*

I make no apology for quoting so largely from so lively a writer as Mr. M’Culloch, whose interesting work is not known in this country, except by a few individuals. This gentleman, who is a minister in Nova Scotia, in connexion with the Associate Antiburgher Synod, has most ably exposed the errors of Popery, and the quibbling, shuffling practices of its advocates in that part of the world, who are truly worthy of being the brethren, and of the same body, with those in this country.

Relics have commonly been used for the vilest purposes of avarice and imposition. It was not enough to excite the devotion of the people, to have the most splendid and richly adorned buildings for the celebration of their idolatrous rites, unless they had them enriched by the bones of some saint; and these bones themselves could not be expected to excite much reverence, unless some extraordinary virtue were ascribed to them, such as the healing of diseases; that is, unless divine power were supposed to reside in them. It was easy for the priests to say that such power resided in the bones of any deceased man or woman, which they taught the people to worship. It was a lie to be sure; but that was a matter of no consideration, if it brought multitudes of pilgrims to pay their money, and feast their eyes with the sacred relics. In order to maintain the credit of such

relics, it was necessary to maintain a succession of miracles. All the art and cunning of a numerous host of monks and priests was called into activity. It became their sole business to tell lies, and to deceive the people, by means of false miracles, which they pretended to perform by the touch of their relics, or by getting the diseased person to pray before the altar on which they were laid. They hired persons for the purpose of counterfeiting blindness, lameness, madness, and in short all the diseases incident to men; and then they pretended to cure them by touching them with some dry bone, or by some old rotten rag. They had such power over the minds of the people, that few doubted the reality of what they told them; and as for those whom they had hired to personate the blind and the lame, they had them bound by a solemn oath not to divulge the truth; they would promise them heaven, if they kept the secret; and threaten them with hell, if they told it; and during a period of general ignorance and superstition, there were few indeed who had the courage to despise such threats and such promises. I could give some curious instances of absurd and false miracles said to have been performed by the relics of St. Wenefride, when her rotten carcass was removed to Shrewsbury; but some of my readers were so nauseated by former extracts from that "*excellent* little volume," as Mr. Andrews calls it, that I dare not venture to quote any more from it.

It is well known that the authority of Scripture goes a very little way with Papists, if it be opposed to any of their traditions and superstitions: yet if they can find a passage in which the words, detached from their connexion, or taken in a perverted sense, seem to countenance any doctrine or practice of theirs, they gladly avail themselves of it. Thus they do profess to find, in Scripture, a warrant for worshipping dead men's bones, &c. "The pious Josiah," says the American opponent of Mr. M'Culloch, "respected the bones of the prophet, who foretold the destruction of Bethel, 4 b. of Kings xxiii. 18. and Moses himself returning from Egypt, took with him the bones of the great patriarch Joseph."

It would be well, if those who make use of these passages to prove the propriety of worshipping dry bones, or any thing besides the one living and true God, would read them in connexion with the context, and those parts of the sacred history to which they refer. Let them, for instance, read what is said of Josiah and the bones of the prophet, which in our Bibles is 2 Kings xxiii. 4—20. Let them compare this with what is related in the xiii. chapter of the same book, and they will find, that the prophet denounced the destruction of Bethel, because they presumed to give divine honour to a creature, or to worship God by images. It is true, Josiah did respect the bones of the true prophet, and

also of the lying prophet, who was buried beside him, so as not to burn them, when he was burning those of the idolatrous priests. Though acting under a divine commission, Josiah did not profess, like the Pope of Rome, to be able to distinguish the bones of the saint from those of the sinner, seeing they were blended together in one grave, and therefore he respected both. But how was this respect shown? Not by giving an arm to one priest, and a leg to another, to hang round their necks, when they performed divine service; not by sending fragments of their ribs and skulls to the temple at Jerusalem, to be adored by the many thousands of Israel, when they came to their great festivals. This is exactly what Papists would have done; but Josiah knew that this would have brought as heavy a punishment on Jerusalem as that which he was the instrument of inflicting upon Bethel. He respected their bones, as those of every saint ought to be respected; that is, he allowed them to rest quietly in their graves. "Let them alone," said Josiah, "let no man move his bones; so they let his bones alone."

When Joseph was a dying, he spoke of the departure of the children of Israel out of Egypt, and gave commandment concerning his bones, Heb. xi. 22. This it is said he did by faith. This was a testimony to the children of Israel, that though he had lived almost a century in the court of Egypt, he died in the faith of the promise of the God of Israel. During the dreary period of the bondage of the people, the fact, known by them all, that the body of Joseph was kept in a state capable of being removed, was calculated to confirm the faith of believing Israelites, and to encourage them to hope for deliverance. Moses also testified his faith in the promise of the God of Israel, when he took the body of Joseph out of Egypt, and carried it along with the congregation, during all their wanderings in the wilderness. But let it be remembered, the body was put in a coffin in Egypt; and we have no hint that ever it was seen again by human eyes; and it was carried out of Egypt, through the desert, not that it might be worshipped, but that it might be buried. It was his dying command, that his body should rest with those of his fathers in the land of promise; believing, no doubt, that as he slept with them, so he would be raised up together with them, to the enjoyment of the everlasting inheritance.

The American Papist is not more successful in his appeal to the instance of the brazen serpent, as a Scriptural authority for worshipping relics. "We know," says he, "the veneration which was conceived for the brazen serpent, on which whoever looked, when bit by the fiery serpents, were instantly healed." "And we know, likewise," says Mr. M'Culloch, "that when Israel treated it with Popish honours, Hezekiah, a pretended Reformer, sprung up in the church, and afforded an example which

has been duly imitated by his Protestant successors. ‘He removed the high places and brake the images, and cut down the groves, and brake in pieces the brazen serpent which Moses had made; for unto those days the children of Israel did burn incense unto it.’” Papists will no doubt execrate such conduct;—it is so like that of John Knox, who brake down the altars and images in many a church, at least if his enemies say the truth. No matter: we are assured, upon divine authority, that what Hezekiah did was right in the sight of the Lord, 2 Kings xviii. 3, 4.

It is argued further, that “God wrought special miracles by the hands of Paul, so that from his body were brought unto the sick, handkerchiefs, or aprons, and the diseases departed from them, and the evil spirits went out of them.” Acts xix. 11, 12. But Paul was alive, and these articles were not his relics; nor is it said that the handkerchiefs and aprons had any hand in working the cures which are mentioned. It was God who wrought special miracles by the hands of Paul; and it is admitted that, for the confirmation of the truth which was preached by his inspired Apostles, he wrought many miracles. In this instance, he made the articles of dress which are mentioned, a sign to connect the miracle, in the minds of the people, with the person of his inspired ambassador; but the articles themselves are thrown aside, and never mentioned again, as being of any use in relation to religious worship, though they would be as good as ever as aprons and handkerchiefs; but none but an idolater would have thought of preserving them as objects of worship.

In the 5th chapter of the Acts, ver. 15. we are told that the people brought out their sick into the streets, that the shadow of Peter might overshadow them, in order to their being healed. Now, it is a fact, that I have not been able to find, in any catalogue of relics, the identical shadow of the Apostle, though it might have been caught almost as easily as Joseph’s breath, which Papists profess to have preserved in a phial. The fact is, God wrought such miracles as pleased him by the instrumentality of his Apostles. These were for the purpose of silencing adversaries, and for the confirmation of the truth; they were open to the inspection of enemies; and they were always well authenticated. But the miracles of Popish relics are all done in the dark, or in the presence of such only as are willing to believe them, and not one of them is supported by credible testimony. To the man who boasted that he had made a leap of ten yards, in Rhodes, it was answered, “Make such a leap here, and we will believe you.” So, to our Papists I would say, “Show the power of your relics here, and we will believe you.”

THE

Protestant,

No. LIV.

SATURDAY, JULY 24th, 1819.

It will be gratifying to my Protestant readers to know that my work is known, and spoken of, in the remote dominions of the King of Spain. I know nothing that can form a better conclusion to my dissertation on the worship of images and relics, than the following letter, from a gentleman in the Havannah, island of Cuba, to his friend in Baltimore, which has kindly been handed to me by a gentleman of this city, who received it from a correspondent in the western world. I did not previously know, or even suspect, that THE PROTESTANT was known in the Island of Cuba:—

“ *Havannah, 9th April, 1819.*—I address you, my dear B—, from a place where the Church of Rome may be seen in all her glory. On every hand are indications of her supremacy. Altars, shrines, and consecrated relics meet your view in every direction; while the long-robed priest, bearing the insignia of his office, crosses your path at every step. The immense piles of buildings attached to each of the churches, show very distinctly that they who minister therein, know where to lay *their* heads.

“ The churches are generally very large, and being built of a grey stone, have a very venerable appearance. The interior is finished in rather a coarse manner; and the style of architecture not very commendable. Between the columns, in the recesses, are placed sundry virgins of wax, and saints of stone; the former usually enclosed in a glass case, and arrayed in the style of dress which prevailed in the time of Queen Elizabeth. Here and

there may be seen founts of holy water, and little figures of Christ upon the cross. The appearance of the whole is very paltry; and naturally brings to mind a child's play house upon a large scale. At all hours of the day, you may observe the miserable dupes of this mummary kneeling, crossing themselves, or muttering their prayers before the image of their favourite patron saint, or confessing in some corner to one of their jugglers.

"Yesterday commenced the ceremonies attending the celebration of the death, burial, and resurrection. In this kind of farce, the machinery and scenery employed are very similar to those we have upon the theatre, except that they are formed upon a cheaper plan, and are far inferior in point of execution. About 3 o'clock, P. M. a figure intended to represent our Saviour, was produced at the cathedral, and nailed to a cross previously erected. After the side had been pierced, &c. it was taken down and carried to a private dwelling; and there laid out as for burial. In the course of my evening ramble with an acquaintance, we came to this house, and went in. Had "THE PROTESTANT" been here, he would certainly have given us a Number upon the scene which presented itself. At one end of a large room was erected a stage, on which was placed this sorry representation of a corpse, arrayed in a great deal of finery. In the rear was a large cross, and on each side a trio of hideous angels, each bearing a candlestick, behind which was placed a candle, so as to appear, from a particular position, to be in it. As this position had reference to but one candle at a time, the arrangement was so clumsy, that it cannot with propriety be called a deception. On the extremes, and facing each other, were figures to represent the Virgin and Joseph. The former was equipt with a richly wrought petticoat, hoop, stays, high-heeled shoes, and lace head dress; and the latter with a purple military coat covered with lace, brown breeches, buckles, silk stockings, ruffles, and a well dressed powdered peruke, surmounted by a cocked hat. Rays of glory, executed in gilt wood, formed a finishing decoration to both figures.

"The room was crowded with persons of all ages, sexes, colours, and conditions. They kneeled for a few moments, and then made way for others. I took my position on one side of the room, and eyed this scene with emotions which I will not attempt to describe. I could have laughed at the ridiculous display which was before me; but when I reflected to what an event it was referred; when I cast my eyes upon those who kneeled around me, and compared their conduct with that reverence which a rational creature should pay to his God, my heart sickened within me. But I must leave reflection for a more fit occasion, and content myself with description.

" This afternoon, the burial was performed. The aforesaid representation of a corpse was carried from one church, through three or four of the principal streets, to another church, where it is to remain till *that resurrection*, which takes place *to-morrow*. I had a view of the whole from the gallery of a friend's house. A file of soldiers, music, several priests and attendants bearing badges, the standard of the cross, soldiers, priests, the body upon a kind of stage, soldiers, officers civil and military, priests, soldiers, the Virgin and Joseph, priests and soldiers, horse, foot, and artillery, the whole flanked by citizens in single file, each bearing a wax taper of five feet in length, formed the cavalcade. The introduction of artillery has taken place, since the present governor came into office. The reason he alleges for this innovation is certainly more rational than the ceremony: ' A Spanish general is entitled to one piece at his funeral, and certainly Jesus Christ should have two.' "

" *Saturday, 10th April, 1819.*—As the ceremonies of this morning took place very early, I did not attend them, but I will give you a brief account of what I was told of it.

" The figure, which had been deposited in a grave yesterday, is brought forth repainted, &c. in order to represent animation; and sallying forth upon the shoulders of several negroes, and accompanied by an immense crowd, meets the Virgin and Joseph, (borne with like ceremony) at the intersection of two streets. The former proceedings you will, no doubt, suppose ridiculous enough. Those which take place here, ' out-Herod Herod.' The Virgin, who, by the by is understood to be seeking her dead Son, thus unexpectedly meeting the living one, is, as might be looked for, surprised,—pauses, trembles, partially turns, and finally flies away in terror. These various emotions are performed by mere motions of the wooden stages upon which the characters are borne. The shouts and congratulations of the *pious* crowd now undeceive the Virgin, whose fears being removed, she countermarches. A happy meeting takes place; and the several figures, having thus faithfully performed their allotted duties, are, with all due reverence, carried to their respective quarters, and safely deposited, until their services shall be again required.

" About one-fourth of the people's time is spent in this manner. Scarce a week passes, but some saint or other is borne through the streets. There is yet some hope for this benighted land. I find that among the upper classes of society, these things are not looked upon with much regard, farther than as they are calculated to keep the vulgar in order. The dissolute lives which the priests lead must eventually open the eyes of all classes to the corruptions of the Church of Rome. Oh ye

that possess the gospel unadulterated, ye know not the extent of the blessing! When I see the little children crossing themselves before some figure or image, I think of the Sunday schools, and thank God that my country is possessed of them."

What must that religion be which encourages, nay, which, in a great measure, consists in the exhibition of such disgusting and profane farces, as that above described! My readers, I suppose, would expect to hear of no better in a Spanish island; but what will they think, when I show them that practices equally ridiculous and wicked are exhibited by Papists every year in Ireland, notwithstanding the light of knowledge which shines all around them. With a description of what takes place in that country, I shall occupy the remainder of this sheet.—On the 28th of June, every year, at Waterford, the stone coffin of St. Dagland is emptied of such human bones as have been placed in it, (which bones are replenished every year, it is said, by a miracle), and borne away as precious relics, and preservatives against various afflictions.

In the county of Tipperary, the earth which covers the grave of father Sheely, boiled in milk, cures a variety of diseases. In the year 1763, this priest was convicted of treason, on the clearest evidence, and hanged. He is now, it is said, about to be canonized at Rome; and this no doubt will be a stimulus to other priests, to practise his treason, when they shall have an opportunity. *Phil. Gaz. June 30th, 1818.*

But there are some practices in Ireland, which not only equal those which I have related as taking place in Cuba, in absurdity and impiety, but which far excel them in wickedness and cruelty; as will appear by the following interesting letter, which I copy from the Hull Rockingham Newspaper, of May 18th, 1816, omitting a few sentences for want of room. It is, indeed, anonymous, but it is not to be supposed the Editor would make himself responsible, without knowing the author, and knowing that he was worthy of credit. I am, indeed, in possession of a written account of similar superstitions, by a minister in this country, who was an eye witness of them, at a holy well near Sligo, but who does not go so much into detail as the writer of the following. I connect this with the worship of relics, because it is the same principle that leads to venerate holy wells and to adore holy bones:—

TO THE EDITOR OF THE ROCKINGHAM.

SIR,

At a time when the attention of this country is almost entirely devoted to the frivolities, and vices, and imbecilities, and suffer-

ings of the French nation ;——it may not be impertinent to remind the people of our own country that there are subjects, yet more nearly connected with us, who are sunk in deeper shades of ignorance and barbarism than the French, the Italians, or even the miserable Spaniards.——

I shall, for the present, confine myself to giving you an account of an annual festival, which is held in some particular places in different parts of Ireland, on every midsummer's eve, and the extravagancies which I witnessed, together with a few English friends, at some celebrated wells of St. Patrick, in the county of Down, in order that you may judge how far the statement of honourable members of the House of Commons are to be relied on, which would encourage a belief that, as to the *general diffusion of knowledge and education, the lower Irish have greatly the advantage of the same class of people in our favoured island.*

When or how the custom which I shall describe originated, I know not, nor is it necessary to enquire ; but, every midsummer's eve, thousands of Roman Catholics, many from distant parts of the country, resort to these celebrated holy wells, to cleanse their souls from sin, and clear their mortal bodies of diseases. The influx of people of different ranks, for some nights before the one in which alone, during the whole year, these wells possess this power, (for on all other days and nights in the year they rank not above common draw-wells,) is prodigious; and their attendants, hordes of beggars, whose ragged garments, if once taken off, could not be put on again by the ingenuity of man, infest the streets and lanes, and choose their lodgings in the highways and hedges. Having been previously informed of the approach of this miraculous night, and having made ourselves acquainted with the locality of the wells, early in the evening we repaired to the spot: we had been told that we should see something quite new to us, and we met with what scarcely was credible on ocular evidence. The spot, on which this scene of superstitious folly was exhibited, was admirably adapted to heighten every attendant circumstance of it; the wonderful wells, of which there are four, being situated in a square or patch of ground, surrounded by steep rocks, which reverberated every sound, and redoubled all the confusion. The *coup d'œil* of the square, on our approach, presented a floating mass of various coloured heads, and our ears were astonished with confused and mingled sounds of mirth and sorrow, of frantic, enthusiastic joy, and deep desponding ravings. On descending into the square, we found ourselves immediately in the midst of innumerable groups of these fanatics, running in all directions, confusedly, in appearance, but methodically, as we afterwards found, in reality—the men and the women were barefooted, and

the heads of all were bound round with handkerchiefs. Some were running in circles, some were kneeling in groups, some were singing in wild concert, some were jumping about like maniacs, at the end of an old building, which, we were told, was the ruins of a chapel erected, with several adjacent buildings, in one miraculous midsummer's night, by the tutelar saint of the wells, of whose talent as a mason they give, it must be confessed, no very exalted opinion. When we had somewhat recovered from the first surprise which the (to us) unaccountably fantastic actions of the crowd had given us, we endeavoured to trace the progress of some of these deluded votaries through all the mazes of their mystic penance. The first object of them all appeared to be the ascent of the steepest and most rugged part of the rock, up which both men and women crawled their painful way, on their hands and bare knees. The men's clothes were all made so as to accommodate their knees with all the sharpness of the pointed rock; and the poor women, many of them young and beautiful, took incredible pains to prevent their petticoats from affording any defence against its torturing asperities. Covered with dust and perspiration, and blood, they at last reached the summit of the rock, where, in a rude sort of chair, hewn out of the stone, sat an old man, probably one of their priesthood, who seemed to be the representative of St. Patrick, and the high-priest of this religious frenzy. In his hat each of the penitents deposited a halfpenny, after which he turned them round a certain number of times, listened to the long catalogue of their offences, and dictated to them the penance they were to undergo or perform. They then descended the rock by another path, but in the same manner and posture, equally careful to be cut by the flints, and to suffer as much as possible: this was, perhaps, more painful travelling than the ascent had been—the suffering knees were rubbed another way—every step threatened a tumble; and if any thing could have been lively there, the ridiculous attitudes of these descenders would have made us so. When they gained the foot of the hill, they (most of them) bestowed a small donation of charity on some miserable groups of supplicants, who were stationed there. One beggar, a cripple, sat on the ground, at one moment addressing the crowd behind him, and swearing that all the Protestants ought to be burnt out of the country, and, in the same breath, begging the penitents to give him one halfpenny for the love of “*swate blessed Jasus*.” The penitents now returned to the use of their feet, and commenced a running sort of Irish jiggyish walk round several cairns, or heaps of stones, erected at different spaces: this lasted for some time. Suddenly they would prostrate themselves before the cairn, and ejaculate some hasty prayers; as suddenly they would rise, and re-

sume their mill-horse circumrotation. Their eyes were fixed; their looks spoke anxiety, almost despair; and the operations of their faculties seemed totally suspended. They then proceeded to one end of the old chapel, and seemed to believe that there was a virtue, unknown to us heretics, in *one particular stone* of the building, which every one was careful to touch with the right hand; those who were tall did it easily; those who were less left no mode of jumping unpractised to accomplish it. But the most remarkable, and doubtless the most efficient of the ceremonies, was reserved for the last; and surely nothing was ever devised by man, which more forcibly evinced how low our nature can descend. Around the largest of the wells, which was in a building very much, to common eyes, like a stable, all those who had performed their penances were assembled, some dressing, some undressing, many *stark naked*. A certain number of them were admitted at a time into this holy well, and there men and women, of every age, bathed promiscuously, without any covering. They undressed before bathing, and performed the whole business of the toilet afterwards in the open air, in the midst of the crowd, without appearing sensible of the observations of lookers-on, perfectly regardless of decency, perfectly dead to all natural sensations. This was a strange sight, but so nearly resembling the feast of lunatics, that even the voluptuary would have beheld it without any emotions but those of dejection. The penance having terminated in this marvellous ablution, the penitents then adjourned, either to booths and tents to drink, or join their friends. The air then rang with musical monotonous singing, which became louder with every glass of whiskey, finishing in frolicsome debauch, and laying, in all probability, the foundation for future penances and more thorough ablutions. No pen can describe all the confusion; no description can give a just idea of the noise and disorder which filled this *hallowed* square, this theatre of fanaticism, this temple of superstition, of which the rites rival all that we are told of in the East. The minor parts of the spectacle were filled up with credulous mothers half drowning their poor children to cure their sore eyes; with cripples, who exhibited every thing that has yet been discovered in deformity, expecting to be washed straight, and to walk away nimble and comely. The experience of years had not shaken their faith; and, though nobody was cured, nobody went away doubting. Shouting and howling, and swearing and carousings, filled up every pause, and 'threw o'er this spot of earth the air of hell.'

"I was never more shocked and struck with horror; and perceiving many of them intoxicated with religious fervour and all-potent whiskey, and warming into violence, before mid-night, at which time the distraction was at its climax, I left this scene of

human degradation, in a state of mind not easily to be described. The whole road from the wells to the neighbouring town was crowded with such supplicants as preferred mortal halfpence to holy penance. The country around was illuminated with watch-fires; the demons of discord and fear were abroad in the air; the pursuits of the world, and occupations of the peaceful, appeared put a stop to, by the performance of ceremonies, disgraceful when applied to propitiate an all-compassionate Divinity, whom these religionists were determined, and taught, to consider jealous rather than merciful.

“I wish it were in my power, without insincerity, to pay a compliment to the Irish Catholic clergy, whom Mr. Plunkett lately designated, to the astonishment of every body, as ‘that most respectable fraternity.’ I wish I could bear witness to their mildness and purity of character; their admonitory attentions to their illiterate flocks; their liberality, and their disposition to conciliate. So greatly the contrary is the truth, that I have only the alternative of passing them over in silence, or of stigmatizing them, with a few exceptions, as a low-lived, intriguing, violent set of men, whose power is almost unlimited; whose unrestrained abuse of that power, and shameless want of dignity in the performance of their functions, do more towards inflaming the minds of the lower orders than any other causes: they are altogether a lower order of beings than the clergymen of the same persuasion in England. On this occasion, they were the mad priests of these Bacchanalian orgies; the fomenters of fury; the setters on to strife; the mischievous ministers of the debasement of their people, lending their aid to plunge their credulous congregations in ceremonious horrors: perhaps the better to secure to themselves the undisputed enjoyment of the exercise of that tyranny, which is so generally practised in other Catholic countries, and which has embryo admiring Inquisitors enough in Ireland to pray for its establishment.

“I have trespassed much longer on your attention than I designed when I began this letter. This is but a single page of a book of enormities; it will, I doubt not, supply you with various reflections and interesting speculations on a people so energetic, yet so lost; so determined, yet so mistaken; so capable of the grandest impressions, such sad victims of the tyranny of superstition. Perhaps, hereafter, if your publication of this may be considered as an intimation that you think an exposition of such things useful, I may transmit some further particulars concerning that unfortunate country.

“VOLERO.”

THE

Protestant,

No. LV.

SATURDAY, JULY 31st, 1819.

It is a common trick of Popish writers to represent the reading of the Bible as the fruitful source of sedition and treason. Yet it so happens, that in Scotland, the most Bible-reading country in the world, there have been only two instances of rebellion since the happy Revolution of 1688; and both of these were headed and promoted by Papists, who are hostile to the general reading of the Bible. It is well known that the rising in 1715, and also that in 1745, had nothing less for their object than the restoration of the Popish house of Stuart, and with them the Popish religion itself. One of the great instigators of the former insurrection was the Earl of Derwentwater, who, as a reward of his treason, was beheaded in London, in the year 1716. This nobleman was so zealous a Papist, that when the absurdities of some things which are held sacred by the Church of Rome were mentioned to him, he replied, "That for every tenet of that church, repugnant to reason, in which she requires an implicit belief, he wished there were twenty, that he might thereby have a nobler opportunity of exercising and displaying his faith."

Without stopping to expose the impiety of wishing any thing to be a matter of faith, or more things to be matters of faith, than God has been pleased to reveal, I refer to this anecdote merely to introduce the subject of this Paper, and to show how tenacious Papists are of things repugnant to reason; and how much they even prefer such things before those which are plain and indisputable. It is reasonable to believe what God has said, though we cannot comprehend it, or understand how it should

be; but it is certain that he has not called us to believe any thing that is unreasonable or impossible, for no such things are contained in the revelation which he has given us; and yet the very impossibility and unreasonableness of a thing is, with such Papists as the nobleman above mentioned, a reason for his believing it. "Do you believe in transubstantiation?" said a Protestant to a Papist. "Yes, I do," was the reply. "Why," said the other, "the thing is impossible." "And I," said the Papist, "believe it, *because* it is impossible!"

I am now about to enter upon that branch of the idolatry of the Church of Rome, which consists in their sacrifice of the mass, adoration of the host, &c.; but as this is connected with the monstrous absurdity of transubstantiation, I must be allowed to bestow some attention upon this doctrine, which is one of the main pillars of their idolatrous temple. I merely touched upon it in my fourth Number; but I shall now present the subject more fully to the view of the reader.

That very night in which Christ was betrayed, he instituted an ordinance, which he appointed to be observed by his disciples to the end of the world. It is of the nature of a feast; and, from the hour of the day in which it was first observed, it is called "The Lord's Supper." It is called, by some, a sacrament, which signifies an oath, or sacred pledge; by others the eucharist, or thanksgiving. Without entering upon a discussion with regard to the propriety of these terms, I think I shall proceed upon the most sure ground, when I use the language of the Apostle Paul, who gave it no other name than the Lord's Supper, 1 Cor. xi. 20. The materials of the feast are simply bread and wine; but these are used to represent spiritual blessings: hence the same Apostle says, 1 Cor. x. 16. "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? the bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?" From this it is evident, that the symbols which were used by the Apostles, in order to represent the spiritual blessings which are derived from the breaking of the body, and the shedding of the blood, of Christ, were plain bread and wine, and nothing else. By eating the bread, and drinking the wine, his people, in their social capacity, according to his appointment, show forth his death; and in the exercise of faith over the symbols of his broken body and shed blood, they really enjoy the benefit of his death, in the assurance of pardon, and the enjoyment of peace of mind and heart, imparted by the Holy Spirit, as the fruit of Christ's atoning sacrifice.

But this doctrine was too simple and too spiritual for the Church of Rome, when she began to give heed to seducing spirits, and when she became herself the great seductress of the world called Christian. Having lost sight of the design of *commemorating* the death of Christ by the elements of bread and wine,

nothing less would satisfy her than the turning of the elements into the very body and blood of Christ himself; nor did she stop here: by degrees she rose to the climax of absurdity, and maintained that the whole substance of the bread, after the priest had pronounced the words of consecration, was converted, not only into the body and blood, but also into the soul and divinity, of Jesus Christ; and the same with regard to the wine. This is the doctrine of the Council of Trent, of the Douay Catechism, and of all the Popish Catechisms in Latin, French, and English, which have come in my way; and these are not few. As the authors of these Catechisms rest the doctrine upon the supreme authority of the Council of Trent, I shall state here what the said holy council have authentically decreed upon the subject:—

“ Since Christ, our Redeemer, has said that that was truly his own body which he offered under the appearance of bread, it has therefore been always believed in the Church of God, and it is now again declared by this holy council—that, by the consecration of the bread and wine, there is effected a conversion of the whole substance of the bread, into the substance of the body of Christ our Lord, and of the whole substance of the wine, into the substance of his blood: which conversion is fitly and properly termed, by the holy Catholic Church, transubstantiation.” *Concil. Trid. Less. xiii. cap. iv.*

“ If any one shall deny that, in the most holy sacrament of the Eucharist, there are contained, truly, really, and substantially, the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity, of our Lord Jesus Christ, and therefore the whole Christ; or say that he is in it only as a sign, or figure, or by his influence,—he is accursed.

“ If any one shall say that, in the sacrament of the Eucharist, the substance of the bread and wine remains together with the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, (this is the *consubstantiation* of the Lutheran church) and shall deny the wonderful and singular conversion of the whole substance of the bread into his body, and the whole substance of the wine into his blood, the appearances only of bread and wine remaining, which conversion the Catholic Church most properly terms transubstantiation,—he is accursed.

“ If any one shall deny that, in the adorable sacrament of the Eucharist, a separation being made, the whole Christ is contained in each element or species, in the separate parts of each element or species,—he is accursed!” *Ibid. cap. viii. Fletcher's Lectures, pp. 142—144.* I think it unnecessary to give the Latin original, which the author gives in a note, and it may easily be seen and consulted by any person who understands the language.

Every genuine Papist firmly believes, at least professes to believe, the doctrine of transubstantiation, as laid down by the

Council of Trent; and every Popish priest not only professes, but swears to the belief of it. Yet I believe our Glasgow Papists are heartily ashamed of it, and blush to avow it. In the Glasgow Chronicle, more than a year ago, Mr. PAX, *alias* St. Ange Simeon, declared as follows:—"Had your correspondent taxed the Catholics with one principle which they profess, I would gladly have acknowledged it." I have taxed them again and again, with professing and maintaining this monstrous absurdity; but there is no acknowledgment forthcoming from Mr. PAX. There is no more truth in his promises than in his assertions; and I hope to show, by and by, that it would be absurd to expect to find truth in any man who really believes in transubstantiation.

The doctrine of the holy Council of Trent, which every Popish priest is sworn to believe, and which every man must believe, or be held as *accursed* (anathema), is simply this:—that what are seen to be bread and wine upon the altar, after the priest has pronounced these words, *Hoc est corpus meum*, &c. (This is my body, &c.) are no longer bread and wine, but the real body and blood, soul and divinity, of Jesus Christ. The priest is understood to possess the miraculous power, by the use of the above words, to convert a piece of bread, in the form of a wafer, into the real body of Jesus Christ, which was born of Mary, which was crucified, was buried, rose again on the third day, and ascended into heaven; and to convert this piece of bread, not only into the body and blood, but also into the soul and divinity, of Jesus Christ. This wonderful conversion is produced by the use of these words, *Hoc est corpus meum*; and this, as Archbishop Tillotson has shown, led certain jugglers to call their sleight-of-hand tricks *hocus-pocus*, which is nothing but a corruption of the priest's *hoc est corpus*, by means of which he commands the whole substance of bread to be gone, and the real body of Christ to assume its place.

Among Protestants, and I may say among persons of common sense, it is not generally reckoned necessary to oppose the absurdity of transubstantiation by serious argument. The bare statement of it is enough to refute it, to the satisfaction of every person whose senses have any authority with his understanding; but Papists are multiplying among us: they are as tenacious as ever of their favourite dogma, that what they see to be bread is not bread, but the God whom they worship; it therefore becomes necessary to treat the subject with some degree of seriousness, lest they should boast that we have no serious objection to the wheaten idol which they make and adore as the Saviour of the world.

The divines of the holy Council of Trent, who were understood to represent the whole Catholic Church, as the Church of Rome is falsely styled, build their transubstantiation upon

these words of Christ, which are literally rendered in English, "This is my body." Every person, acquainted with the style of the inspired penmen, knows that the substantive verb is used in numerous instances, in which it cannot mean the identity of one thing with another, but only resemblance or representation. The fact is, as I have shown by reference to Dr. Clarke, a living Oriental critic, whose words I gave in my fourth Number,—"in the Hebrew, Chaldee, and Chaldeo-Syriac languages, there is no term which expresses *to mean, signify, denote*,"—"hence the Hebrews use a figure, and say *it is*, for *it signifies* ; —thus the seven kine *are* (i. e. represent) seven years." The attentive reader of the Bible will recollect numerous instances of the same nature, the meaning of which it is impossible to mistake, without violating every rule of criticism, and giving up all pretensions to common sense.

It is admitted that, in the Greek language, in which the New Testament was written, there are words which express what we mean in English by *signify, denote, represent, &c.* But it is well known to have been a common thing with the Apostles to write Greek according to the Hebrew idiom, or the Chaldaic, which was their vernacular, or conversation language. Thus the Apostle John, Rev. i. 20. uses the substantive verb as the Hebrews did,—“The seven stars *are* the angels of the seven churches: and the seven candlesticks *are* the seven churches.” Who would imagine from this that the very substance of seven stars, and seven candlesticks, was converted into the very substance of the seven churches in Asia, and of their seven ministers, as I suppose the word *angel* to mean? Yet it must be so, upon the principle laid down by the Council of Trent, and maintained by all good Papists, upon the perversion of the words, “This *is* my body.”

“That our Lord neither spoke in Greek nor Latin, on this occasion, needs no proof. It was, most probably, in what was formerly called the *Chaldaic*, now the *Syriac*, that our Lord conversed with his disciples. Through the providence of God, we have complete versions of the Gospels in this language; and in them, it is likely, we have the precise words spoken by our Lord on this occasion. In Matth. xxvi. 26, 27. the words in the Syriac version are, HONAU PAGRÉE, *this is my body*; HENAU DEMEE, *this is my blood*; of which forms of speech the Greek is a verbal translation; nor would any man, even in the present day, speaking in the same language, use, among the people to whom it was vernacular, other terms than the above to express, *This represents my body, and this represents my blood*,” Dr. Clarke on the Eucharist, p. 53.

“But this form of speech is common, even in our own language, though we have terms enow to fill up the ellipsis. Suppose a man entering into a museum, enriched with the remains of ancient

Greek sculpture; his eyes are attracted by a number of curious busts; and, on enquiring what they are, he learns, this is Socrates, that Plato, &c. Is he deceived by this information? Not at all: he knows well that the busts he sees are not the *identical* persons of these ancient philosophers, poets, orators, historians, and emperors, but only *representations* of their persons in sculpture, between which and the originals there is as essential a difference as between a human body, instinct with all the principles of rational vitality, and a block of marble. When, therefore, Christ took up a piece of bread, brake it, and said, *This is my body*, who but the most stupid of mortals could imagine that he was, at the same time, handling and breaking his own body? Would not any person, of plain common sense, see as great a difference between the *man* Christ Jesus and a *piece of bread*, as between the block of marble and the philosopher it *represented*, in the case referred to above? The truth is, there is scarcely a more common form of speech, in any language, than, this *is*, for, this *represents*, or *signifies*. And as our Lord refers, in the whole of this transaction, to the ordinance of the Passover, we may consider him as saying, 'This bread is now my body, in that sense in which the Pascal lamb was my body hitherto; and this cup is my blood of the New Testament, in the same sense as the blood of bulls and goats has been my blood under the Old; Exod. xxiv. Heb. ix. *i. e.* the pascal lamb, and the sprinkling of blood, represented my sacrifice to the present time; this bread and this wine shall represent my body and blood through all future ages: therefore, do this in remembrance of me.' " *ibid.* p. 53, 54.

There are certain persons of extreme liberality, who are disposed to think the best of every system that is opposed to divine revelation, and to stigmatize as narrow-minded persons, those who will concede nothing which they conceive to rest upon divine authority. Such *liberales* will affect to consider transubstantiation as a mere obsolete dogma of the dark ages; very absurd, to be sure, but a thing that no liberal-minded man would lay to the charge of "enlightened Catholics" of the present day. It is, indeed, nearly three hundred years since the Council of Trent ordained the canon, which I have given in this Number: I do not know how long it is since the Douay Doctors composed their catechism, of which I gave the section on transubstantiation in my fourth Number: and I admit the possibility of persons, in an enlightened age, renouncing, in effect, the nonsense of a dark age, while they swear to the very words by which such nonsense is expressed. But our modern Papists have no right to avail themselves of this admission; for every priest among them not only swears to maintain every doctrine of the Council of Trent, but, in the most recent summaries of religion published by authority in the Church of Rome, the doctrine of transubstan-

tiation is maintained in all the grossness of the darkest ages. To prove this, I shall transcribe the eighth lesson of the "Catechism for the use of all the Churches in the French empire," published in 1806, by the authority of NAPOLEON BUONAPARTE, with the *bull* of the Pope, and the *mandamus* of the Archbishop of Paris.

"Q. What is the sacrament of the Eucharist? A. The Eucharist is a sacrament which contains *really* and *substantially* the body, blood, soul, and divinity, of our Lord Jesus Christ, under the forms or appearance of bread and wine. Q. What is at first put on the altar, and in the chalice? Is it not bread and wine? A. Yes: and it continues to be bread and wine *till the priest pronounces the words of consecration*. Q. What influence have these words? A. The bread is changed into the body, and the wine into the blood, of our Lord. Q. Does nothing of the bread and wine remain? A. Nothing of them remains except the forms. Q. What do you call the forms of the bread and wine? A. That which appears to our senses; as, colour, figure, and taste. Q. Is there nothing under the form of bread, except the body of our Lord? A. Besides his body, there is his blood, his soul, and divinity; because all these are inseparable. Q. And under the form of wine? A. Jesus Christ is there as entire as under the form of bread. Q. When the forms of the bread and wine are divided, is Jesus Christ divided? A. No: Jesus Christ remains entire *under each part* of the form divided. Q. Say, in a word, what Jesus Christ gives us under each form? A. All that he is; that is, *perfect God*, and *perfect man*. Q. Does Jesus Christ leave heaven to come into the Eucharist? A. No: he always continues at the right hand of God, his Father, till he shall come at the end of the world, with great glory, to judge the living and the dead. Q. How then can he be present at the altar? A. By the almighty power of God. Q. Then it is not man that works this miracle? A. No: it is Jesus Christ, whose word is employed in the sacrament. Q. Then it is Jesus Christ who consecrates? A. It is Jesus Christ who consecrates; the priest is only his minister. Q. Must we worship the body and blood of Jesus Christ in the Eucharist? A. Yes, undoubtedly; for this body, and this blood, are inseparably united to his divinity."

Such is the doctrine of the Church of Rome in the nineteenth century, concerning the conversion of the bread and wine, in the Lord's Supper, into the real body, and blood, soul and divinity, of Jesus Christ; and the reader will see that it is not a whit modified, or divested of any of the absurdities which attached to it in the dark ages. To this very day, whenever the "Eucharist" is celebrated in the Church of Rome, the priest having, by the words of consecration, turned the piece of bread into his God, adores it; and holds it up to be adored by the

people. He does the same with the cup, which, in the language of the mass book, is called "this excellent chalice;" and, in the said mass book, we have the following "Divine office for the use of the laity:"—"The person who is to communicate, is ordered to go up to the rails, kneel down, and say the confiteor (confession), with true sorrow and compunction for his sins. After the priest has prayed that God may have mercy upon him, and pardon all his sins, he takes the sacred host (i. e. the consecrated wafer) into his hand, and again turns about, and says, Behold the Lamb of God! Behold him who taketh away the sin of the world! Then he and the communicant repeat thrice, 'Lord, I am not worthy that thou shouldst enter under my roof; speak, therefore, but the word, and my soul shall be healed;' the communicant striking his breast, in token of his unworthiness. Then, says the directory, "having the towel raised above your breast, your eyes modestly closed, your head likewise raised up, and your mouth conveniently opened, receive the holy sacrament on your tongue, resting on your under lip; then close your mouth, and say in your heart, Amen: I believe it to be the body of Christ, and I pray it may preserve my soul to eternal life." *Ordinary of the Mass, page xxxiii. from Clarke on the Eucharist, pages 57, 58.*

As there are some things so plain and self-evident, that it is difficult to prove them by argument; so there are some things so extremely absurd and ridiculous that it is difficult to expose them, or make serious argument to bear upon them. Transubstantiation is an absurdity of this sort. It is more absurd than to assert that the full moon is an Ayrshire cheese; and I suppose it would be difficult to undeceive a man who should make this assertion, by means of serious argument. There are some plausible reasons which he could give for his belief; for instance, he might assert, and appeal to the senses of every man for the truth of it, that the full moon is precisely the size, and shape, and colour, of a good rich Ayrshire cheese; and that, when she is in the meridian, she is right in the direction of Ayrshire from Glasgow. Now, I defy all the Papists in the world to give so many good reasons for believing that a piece of bread, in the form of a wafer, or small biscuit, is not bread, but a real human body. I intend, however, to argue the matter seriously, in my next Number, unless I find it impossible.

THE
Protestant,

No. LVI.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 7th, 1819.

THE doctrine of the Church of Rome, on the subject of the Lord's Supper, is, that after the priest has pronounced the words of consecration, "This is my body," the bread which stood before him upon the altar, or which he held in his hand, is no longer bread, but the real body and blood, soul and divinity, of Jesus Christ; and that a similar change takes place with regard to the wine in the cup, after the priest has pronounced the words, "This is my blood, &c." This, says the Council of Trent, has always been believed in the Church of God; and "this conversion is fitly and properly termed, by the holy Catholic Church, transubstantiation."

I showed in my last Number, that there is no foundation for this doctrine in the words of Christ; and that the use of the substantive verb in the words, "This *is* my body," according to the idiom of the language in which they were spoken, could express no more than this *signifies*, or *represents* my body; yet it is upon the use of the substantive verb, that the Church of Rome has built the monstrous fabric of transubstantiation, adoration of the host, and the propitiatory sacrifice of the mass.

Let us now attend to the words of Christ, and consider in what sense they were understood by his disciples. "And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed, and brake, and gave to the disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is my body. And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave to them, saying, Drink ye all of it: for this is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." Mat. xxvi. 26—28. If the reader will take the trouble to compare this extract with the passage as it stands in his Bible, he will find, that I have omitted

the pronoun *it* which is introduced several times by the translators, distinguished, however, as their supplements usually are, by being printed in italics. They no doubt understood that the word blessed referred to the bread which our Lord took in his hand; and if this were the meaning, their supplement would be correct; but I apprehend this is a mistake; and a mistake which has led many Protestants to suppose that some mysterious change takes place; or that some holiness is imparted to the bread and wine in the Lord's supper, which they had not before the blessing was pronounced. The ordinance undoubtedly is holy. Christ sanctifies it by his presence wherever it is observed according to his appointment; and the believing communicant really partakes, in a spiritual manner, of the benefits of his death. But in order to this it is not necessary that the elements of bread and wine should be in any respect different from what they were before.

In the original Greek there is no word corresponding to the pronoun *it*, which our translators have supplied. The original in the 26th verse is *εὐλογησας*, which more properly signifies "blessed God." "He took bread, and blessed God;" that is he gave thanks, which is the literal meaning of the word *ευχαριστήσας* in the 27th verse which is used in reference to the cup. I think there can be no doubt that the meaning of our Lord in reference to both elements was the same. It was the practice of pious Jews to have a short prayer both before the meat and the drink which they used at their tables, a practice which is observed by religious families where wine is used after dinner, at this day. In conformity with a laudable and religious custom; and also as an example to his people, not only in the observance of this ordinance, but in the use of their ordinary meals, which are to be sanctified by the word of God and prayer, Christ blessed God, or gave thanks to God, on taking the bread, and also on taking the cup.

That Christ blessed God, and not the bread, is farther evident from the word which both Luke and Paul make use of to express what he did on that occasion. It is *ευχαριστήσας*, the very same word which Matthew uses in relation to the cup, and which signifies *gave thanks*; and so our translators have rendered it, Luke xxii. 19. "And he took bread, and *gave thanks*;" and 1 Cor. xi. 23, 24. he "took bread, and when he had *given thanks*, he brake *it*, and said," &c. Here the pronoun *it* is properly supplied, because the action of breaking refers to the bread alone. I conclude, therefore, that the words blessing and giving thanks are expressions of precisely the same import, and that God is the object of both.

Christ took bread, into his hands, no doubt, and brake it, and said, This is my body. The disciples were witnesses of the action,

and they heard his words. Now let us suppose how we would have understood him, had we been in the place of the disciples. They were men of the same feelings and perceptions with ourselves; and as we would have felt and thought, they must have thought and felt. Unless we admit this, we set aside the credibility of the Apostles' testimony altogether. If we say they were men of other feelings and perceptions than we are, then we cannot judge of their testimony according to those rules of evidence which are applied to the "witness of men." They saw their Lord reclining at table, and taking bread in his hands; they saw him break the bread, they received the broken pieces into their own hands, and they ate them. They heard him say, This is my body; but they expressed no surprise, which they would have done, had they seen him break his body in pieces, with his own hands, and give the fragments to them to be eaten. We know that such an unexpected operation would overwhelm us with astonishment and dismay; and it would have done the same to the disciples had it actually taken place. They would have been, if possible, still more surprised, if after having eaten his body, they still saw him reclining where he was, taking a cup into his hands, and telling them that this was his blood which they were now to drink. Viewing the matter as it really was, that the bread and the wine represented his body and his blood, which were about to be broken and shed, every thing is plain and intelligible; but viewing it in any other light, the thing is absurd and impossible. Had the disciples ate the body of Christ, that which appeared and spoke to them afterwards, must have been a mere phantom. It must have been a phantom that was crucified, and not a real crucifixion. Then there was no real sacrifice offered to God upon the cross; no real atonement for sin; then a propitiatory sacrifice is still necessary; and the Church of Rome professes to have one to offer every day, that is the mass, which they call a propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead.

Thus we see that transubstantiation is not a mere harmless absurdity to be laughed at. It strikes at the root of the Christian religion. It subverts the doctrine of the cross of Christ; and removes the only foundation on which a sinner can hope for the pardon of his sins, and the salvation of his soul. Some senators are reported lately to have said, that it hurt the feelings of certain Protestants to be obliged, in order to admission into certain offices, to make the declaration which the law requires against transubstantiation. I am persuaded that these tender-hearted Protestants, and the senators who pleaded for them, do not know what transubstantiation is, else they would use much stronger language in condemning it than the law requires; and certainly persons ought to know what it is which they declare against, as well as what they declare for.

If it were true that the elements in the Lord's Supper were changed into something which they were not before, we would expect to find the inspired writers speaking of them after the change by the name of the thing into which they were changed or transubstantiated. For instance, in 1 Cor. xi. 26—28, we should read, "For as often as ye eat this *body*, and drink this *blood*, ye do shew the Lord's death till he come. Wherefore whosoever shall eat this *body*, and drink this *blood*, unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord. But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that *body* and drink of that *blood*." Such would be a true Popish reading; but to show that the Apostle had no idea of transubstantiation, he calls the elements plain bread and wine to the end of the sentence.—By a figure of speech, indeed, he uses the word cup for the wine which was in it; but upon the Popish principle of interpretation, there was no wine at all, and no need of any; the cup itself literally must be taken for the blood of Christ.

The bread is understood to have become the real body of Christ before it is broken, else it would not be the breaking of his body. The change takes place on pronouncing the words, *Hoc est corpus meum*, which is done before breaking. But the Apostle speaks of it as still bread after the blessing, that is, after what are called the words of consecration; nay, he calls it bread after it has been broken. "The cup of blessing which we bless, (that is, for which we bless God, or give thanks) is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? the *bread* (not the *body*) which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ? For we being many are one bread and one body: for we are all partakers of that one *bread*." 1 Cor. x. 16, 17. The last expression might indeed be rendered one *loaf*, which shows the unity of the church or body of Christ; and upon the Popish mode of interpretation, the many members of the church in Corinth were transubstantiated into one loaf, and at the same time, really and literally, into one human body, or into one individual person, for if it be a living body, we must suppose it to have a soul. And the Church of Rome is not satisfied with representing the bread as changed into the body of Christ, but also into his soul and divinity, for these are inseparable; then, I say, upon this principle, when Paul used these words, "We being many *are* one body," not only the church in Corinth, but he himself, and all the Christians in the world, were instantly converted into a single individual. This is very absurd; but it is not so absurd as the Popish doctrine of transubstantiation. It is easier to suppose a number of creatures converted into one, than to suppose a piece of bread converted into the living God.

The advocates of transubstantiation affect to have scriptural

authority for the doctrine in the words of Christ, John vi. 50, 51. "This is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof and not die. I am the living bread which came down from heaven: if any man eat of this bread he shall live for ever; and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world." To the same purpose, verses 53—55, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day; for my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed." This is very plain and easy to be understood by those whose faith rests upon the word of God. Christ was addressing a crowd of people who were anxious about a meal of meat. They had seen him, in a miraculous manner, feed many thousands by a few loaves and fishes. Some of them had eaten of the food thus provided; and they followed him to the other side of the lake, as appears, with no higher motive than to get another meal, without working or paying for it. Jesus knew, and reproved their sordid and selfish disposition. "Ye seek me," says he, "not because ye saw the miracles; but because ye did eat of the loaves and were filled." He tells them that they ought to be more concerned to obtain heavenly blessings, than even their necessary food. "Labour not for the meat which perisheth; but for that meat which endureth unto everlasting life, which the Son of man will give unto you." verses 26, 27. This heavenly food was the doctrine concerning himself, as devoted, and about to offer himself to God, a sacrifice for the sins of the world; and it was to be enjoyed by believing in him, or coming to him, for these are expressions of precisely the same import. "Jesus said unto them, (ver. 35.) I am the bread of life: he that cometh unto me shall never hunger; and he that believeth on me shall never thirst." Here the words coming and believing, are what are called convertible terms; the one may be used for the other, in the two clauses of the sentence, and the meaning will be precisely the same. Now, coming and believing, or, say believing itself, in relation to hunger and thirst, must be something else than literally eating and drinking, especially as it relates to the flesh and blood of a living person. In short, the doctrine of Christ crucified is proposed for the acceptance and belief of sinners of the human race; and he that believes it shall be saved. "This," says Jesus, (ver. 40.) "is the will of him that sent me, that every one who seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life." Believing in Christ is as necessary to the life of the soul, as eating and drinking are to that of the body. As the eagerness of the people to obtain food, led him to direct their minds to that

which is spiritual and eternal; and as they reminded him of what Moses had done in giving manna to their fathers in the wilderness, he takes occasion to tell them that it was not Moses, but his Father who gave the manna to their fathers; that his Father now gave the *true bread* from heaven, that of which the manna was only a type or shadow, and that by believing in him their souls should live, as by eating the manna the people lived in the wilderness.

But the Church of Rome will have it, that Christ here speaks of literally eating his flesh and drinking his blood, which is the very mistake of the carnal Jews. They "strove among themselves, saying, How can this man give us his flesh to eat?" This was a very natural question, supposing him to speak of literally eating his body. It was a kind of food to which the Jews had not been accustomed, and for the eating of which there was no warrant in their law. They "said this is a hard saying, who can hear it?" and from that day many who were called disciples, as having professed to be for a time his followers, went back, and walked no more with him. Now the Church of Rome really holds and teaches at this day, the very doctrine for which the carnal Jews were condemned. Papists maintain that, literally, Christ gives his body to be eaten, and his blood to be drunk. The Jews, mistaking his meaning, understood him to teach this doctrine, and therefore they rejected both it and him, because the thing was absurd and impious; and the Papists, mistaking his meaning, have adopted the construction of the carnal Jews, and they maintain it most pertinaciously, though it be absurd and impious.

Those who partake of the Lord's Supper unworthily, are said, 1 Cor. xi. 29, to "eat and drink judgment to themselves, not discerning the Lord's body," from which some Popish writers triumphantly exclaim, "How can they discern the Lord's body if it be not there?" To this it may be enough to reply, that it is there under the symbolical representation of the elements of bread and wine, which he appointed to represent his body in that holy ordinance. The believing Israelite discerned the Lord's body in the Pascal Lamb, which prefigured the sacrifice of Christ; but I suppose no Jew ever imagined that the Lamb was the real Messiah; so every one who eats the Lord's Supper in faith, discerns the Lord's body in the symbols which represent and commemorate his death; but it was reserved for the Church of Rome to excel in impiety and absurdity all that had been foolishly maintained by the Jews in times of the greatest apostacy and idolatry, by teaching that the symbols which represent the Saviour are really the Saviour himself.

It is reported of a plain common sense man, that when some-

body denied that there was such a thing as motion, he thought it a sufficient reply to rise up and walk : So to any person who maintains that a piece of bread is the real body of Christ, it might be a sufficient answer to hold it up before his eyes. Our sight is the most perfect of all our senses. We cannot properly be said to believe, but rather to know a thing to be what we see it to be. But the thing in question is not subject to the evidence of one sense only. The touch, the taste, and the smell, as well as the sight, unite in bearing testimony to the identity of the thing consecrated with what it was before consecration. What were bread and wine, we see, and feel, and taste, and smell, to be bread and wine still ; and though an angel were to come from heaven and tell us that these are not bread and wine, but the real natural body of Jesus Christ which was born of Mary, we would not be bound to believe him. The Almighty deals with us as with rational creatures. He never called us to believe any thing that is unreasonable, or impossible, or contrary to the evidence of our senses ; and when he condescended to work a miracle by the instrumentality of any of his servants, the senses of men were appealed to, and were actually the judges of the reality of the miracle. No Prophet or Apostle ever had the effrontery to tell the people that he had wrought a miracle, when the people saw nothing done ; but this downright insulting impudence is practised by Romish priests every day.

If the doctrine of transubstantiation were true, we could not be sure of the truth of any thing else. It is, says Dean Swift, a " doctrine, the belief of which makes every thing else unbelievable." " Supposing," says Archbishop Tillotson, " Supposing this doctrine had been delivered in Scripture, in the very same words that it is decreed in the Council of Trent, by what clearer evidence could any man prove to me that such words were in the Bible, than I can prove to him that bread and wine after consecration, are bread and wine still ? He could but appeal to my eyes to prove such words to be in the Bible ; and with the same reason and justice might I appeal to several of his senses, to prove to him that the bread and wine after consecration are bread and wine still." *Discourse on Transubstantiation, Sermons, folio, p. 278.*

If a man were to tell me that he really believes this doctrine, I should hesitate before I would believe any thing that he should say ; in short I would not take the bare word of such a man, or even his oath, in order to verify any fact whatever. His mind must have become familiar with deceit and falsehood. Every time he attends mass, or receives the sacrament, he hears the priest tell a lie, when he declares the bread and wine to be the real body and blood, soul and divinity, of Jesus Christ, and when as such he holds them up to be adored. Now the com-

municant either knows this to be a lie, or he discredits the testimony of his own senses. Take it either way, it will make his testimony unworthy of credit, and his word ought not to be believed without some corroborating evidence.

Take it thus:—When the priest has pronounced the words *Hoc est corpus meum*, and when he affirms that what was bread the moment before, is not bread now, but the real body and blood, soul and divinity of Jesus Christ,—the receiver of the sacrament knows it to be a lie. I say, if this be the case, such a person is not worthy to be believed in any matter whatever; because he who gives his countenance to a lie in one case, will do it in another: and by the daily habit of witnessing, and professing his belief in a lie, he becomes callous to all right feeling with regard to truth and falsehood. This I take to be one reason why it is impossible to find Papists adhering to truth when engaged in controversy about their religion.

Or take it thus:—He believes what the priest tells him,—that the bread upon the altar is, on pronouncing the words of consecration, instantly converted into the real natural body of Christ, &c. and of course he disbelieves his own senses. Then I say this man ought not to be believed in any thing else. His eye-sight deceives him in one case, and why not in another? He sees a thing to be plain bread, but he believes it to be the person of the living Saviour. I would not take this man's word for the identity of any person or thing in the world. He himself cannot be sure of any thing. Suppose him brought to give evidence in a court of justice, he can give no credible evidence. Suppose he appears as a witness against, or in favour of a criminal, he cannot be sure that the person at the bar is the same man whom he had seen commit a certain action, or that he is the same man who had lived many years, and behaved well in his neighbourhood. It is much more likely that by a mistake in his vision, he should take one man for another, than that he should take a piece of bread for a man. But he does the latter every day, therefore, he may do the former at any time. If he is so much deceived by all the senses of seeing, feeling, smelling, and tasting, how can he depend upon the single sense of hearing? I would not believe such a man's report of any words which he had heard. Words are mere sounds, which being conveyed by the medium of the air fall upon the ear, and produce the effect which we call hearing. We cannot be so sure of what reaches the mind through this sense, as of that which we see with our eyes. A man, therefore, who is every day deceived in the sense of seeing, is more likely to be deceived in that of hearing; and I would not take that man's word, or even his oath, for any thing that he professed to have heard or seen.

THE

Protestant,

No. LVII.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 14th, 1819.

HOLY Councils can tell lies with as little scruple as any Pope of Rome, or any vender of old clothes in the Saltmarket. The worthy associate of Messrs. Simeon and M'Hardy * will understand the allusion, and he will be pleased to see that I have not overlooked him altogether. But the falsehood to which I at present refer, is a broad and barefaced one asserted by the holy

* These gentlemen have, I see, been aiding Mr. Andrews again. In the 53d Number of **THE CATHOLIC VINDICATOR**, they give what they call, "Farther Remarks by the Deputation on the 50th Number of **THE PROTESTANT**," in which there is so much shuffling and misrepresentation, that I am strongly tempted to address a second Letter to Mr. M'Hardy; and indeed I would do so forthwith, were I not afraid it would not be reckoned Christian-like to imitate the heathen king of whom it is sung, that "*thrice he slew the slain.*" As for Mr. Simeon, he is by his own confession, *hors de combat*. He has done every thing in his power to uphold the credit of his infallible church, and of her spotless children; and seeing he can do no more, he tells the world by an advertisement in the Glasgow Chronicle of July 27th, that he leaves "all to the retributive dispensations of Providence." While **THE VINDICATOR** is pleading his cause, he disavows **THE VINDICATOR**; and speaks of the foul attempts made to injure his character and his interest, which I suppose he means to apply to me; but as if his pen had known better, it has so arranged the words as to speak the truth against his will, and make his accusations apply to **THE VINDICATOR** alone; for it would not appear from the advertisement that there is such a work as **THE PROTESTANT**. Aware that his character and interest would be affected by being supposed to have a hand in such a work as **THE VINDICATOR**, he declares that he is not the author of any thing that ever appeared in its columns, or of any advertisement relating to it. Mr. M'Hardy, therefore, must bear the whole burden of the work of "the Deputation;" unless indeed he make it appear that Mr. M'Corry can write, and then he may divide the honour with him.

Council of Trent. Speaking of transubstantiation, they say, *it* has always been believed in the Church of God. Now the fact is, it was *never* believed in the Church of God; and I shall proceed to prove that it was not *always* believed in the Church of Rome.

The Bible contains the whole belief of the Church of God, and as we find nothing of transubstantiation there, we might satisfy ourselves with giving the assertion of the holy fathers of the Council a broad denial. Some of the greatest writers and divines, even of the Romish church, admit that the doctrine cannot be proved from the Bible. SCOTUS himself, the great oracle and schoolman, is represented by Bellarmine and others, as having said, that the doctrine of transubstantiation cannot evidently be proved from Scripture; and Bellarmine himself grants that this is not improbable. Suarez and Valasquez acknowledge Durandus to have said as much; and Ocham, another famous schoolman, says expressly, that "the doctrine which holds the substance of the bread and wine to remain after consecration, is neither repugnant to reason nor Scripture." Petrus ab Alliaco, Cardinal of Cambray, says plainly, "that the doctrine of the substance of bread and wine remaining after consecration, is more easy and free from absurdity, more rational, and noways repugnant to the authority of Scripture." Nay, he says expressly, that for the other doctrine, that is, transubstantiation, "there is no evidence in Scripture." Gabriel Biel, another great schoolman and divine of their church, freely declares, "that as to any thing expressed in the canon of Scripture, a man may believe that the substance of bread and wine doth remain after consecration:" And therefore he resolves the belief of transubstantiation into some other revelation, besides Scripture, which he supposes the church had about it. Cardinal Cajetan confesses "that the gospel doth nowhere express that the bread is changed into the body of Christ; that we have this from the authority of the church:" Nay, he goes farther, "that there is nothing in the gospel which enforceth any man to understand these words of Christ, 'This is my body,' in a proper and not in a metaphorical sense; but the church having understood them in a proper sense, they are to be so explained." Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, who is ranked by the Church of Rome among her martyrs, candidly admits, that there is not one word in Scripture "from whence the true presence of the flesh and blood of Christ in our mass can be proved." Most of these divines were firm believers in the doctrine; but they had honesty enough to confess that they did not derive it from the Bible, but only from some other revelation which they supposed the church to have had about it. Some of them, indeed, seem to rest it upon the

mere authority of the church ; but whether she had it by a revelation in her private ear, or invented it, they do not inquire. The above extracts are quoted from a Discourse on Transubstantiation, by Archbishop Tillotson, who refers in the margin to the books and chapters from which they are taken.

Here then we have the admission of many great divines of the Romish church, that transubstantiation is not a doctrine of the Bible. It is not therefore a doctrine believed by the Church of God at any time ; and I shall now proceed to prove that it was not always believed even by the Church of Rome. I shall take the same Discourse of Tillotson for my guide. I shall sometimes use his words, and sometimes my own ; but to prevent confusion, I shall give only the words which he quotes from ancient writers with marks of quotation. I request the reader to observe, that the present discussion is merely about an historical fact, of which these writers were competent witnesses. I do not appeal to their authority, or to that of Tillotson, in support of any Christian doctrine. I admit no authority in religion, but that of the word of God ; but I admit the authority of certain ancient writers as to the matter of fact, whether such a doctrine was held by them, or generally believed in their time. The Fathers have a way of speaking about the ordinance of the Lord's Supper, which is far enough from Scripture simplicity, and which of course I cannot approve ; but all that I have to do with them at present is, to prove by their own words that they had no idea of the bread and wine being converted into the real body and blood, soul and divinity, of Jesus Christ ; or that they were converted into any thing which they were not before, unless it were into the substance of the bodies of the persons who ate and drank them.

I begin with Justin Martyr, who expressly says that " our blood and flesh are nourished by the conversion of that food which we receive in the Eucharist." *Apol. 2. p. 98. edit. Paris, 1636.* I believe it formed no part of our Lord's design, in instituting this ordinance, to make provision for the support of our bodies. The bread and wine were not intended to be used in such quantities as to make a meal ; yet so far as they were used, they are represented by the above author as having the same effect as our ordinary food. It was, therefore, far from his thoughts to represent them as the real body and blood of his Saviour ; and no man, I suppose, will say that these are converted into the nourishment of our bodies.

The second is Irenæus, who, speaking of this sacrament, says, (*Lib. 4. c. 34.*) " The bread which is from the earth, receiving the divine invocation, is now no longer common bread, but the Eucharist, consisting of two things, the one earthly, the other

heavenly." He says it is no longer *common bread*, because it is set apart for a heavenly use; but the expression implies that it is still bread, and nothing else. He says farther, (*Lib. 5. c. 21.*) "When, therefore, the cup that is mixed, (that is, of wine and water) and the bread that is broken, receives the word of God, it becomes the Eucharist of the body and blood of Christ, of which the substance of our flesh is increased and consists." It is therefore plain bread and wine; and so far as it goes, has the same effect upon our bodies as the same substances have when eaten or drank on other occasions.

Tertullian, *Advers. Marchionem*, (*Lib. 4. p. 571. edit. Paris, 1634.*) writes as follows:—"The bread which our Saviour took, and distributed to his disciples, he made his own body, saying, This is my body, that is, *the figure or image of my body.*" This is the very thing for which we contend, which clearly proves that the Christian writers of the early ages of the church had no idea of transubstantiation. Arguing against the sceptics, who denied the certainty of sense, he used this argument: That if we question our senses we may doubt whether our blessed Saviour was not deceived in what he heard, and saw, and touched. "He might," says he, "be deceived in the voice from heaven, in the smell of the ointment with which he was anointed against his burial, and in the taste of the wine which he consecrated in remembrance of his blood." Here Tertullian plainly intimates that our senses are to be regarded, even in the matter of a sacrament; and therefore he knew nothing of transubstantiation.

Origen, in his commentary on Matthew xvth, speaking of the sacrament, says:—"That food which is sanctified by the word of God and prayer, as to that of it which is material, goeth into the belly, and is cast out into the draught;" and he adds, by way of explication,—"It is not the matter of the bread, but the words which are spoken over it, which profiteth him that worthily eateth the Lord; and this (he says) he had spoken concerning the typical and symbolical body." I grant that such expressions as *eating the Lord* are fanciful and incorrect. It is evident that Origen meant no more than eating figuratively; but his successors perverted such figurative language, and spake of literally eating the Lord, which prepared the way for transubstantiation. Notwithstanding the figurative language of this Father, his words are so plainly against any thing but a figure of our Lord being in the Eucharist, that Cardinal Perron rejects his testimony, because he was accused of heresy by some of the Fathers, and he says he talks like a heretic in this place.

That the wine in the cup merely represented the blood of Christ, was evidently the doctrine of St. Cyprian, and of Christians in his time. He wrote an epistle against those who gave

the communion in water only, without wine mingled with it ; and his main argument against them is this, that " the blood of Christ with which we are redeemed and quickened, cannot seem to be in the cup when there is no wine in the cup by which the blood of Christ is represented." *Epist.* 65.

I suppose there are few of the Fathers in more esteem in the Church of Rome than St. Austin, who lived in the fourth century of the Christian era ; and he was undoubtedly a man of singular endowments ; but on many important subjects, he spoke more like a Protestant than a Papist. Popery, indeed, scarcely appeared in the world in a visible form till some ages after his time ; and though many errors and corruptions had then crept into the churches, it would be easy to show that St. Austin's doctrine was more like that of Luther, than like that of the Council of Trent. With regard to the point in hand, his sentiments were evidently those of the Reformation. " Our Lord," says he, " did not doubt to say, This is my body, when he gave the sign of his body." *Tom.* 6. *p.* 187, *Edit. Basil.* 1596. " He commended and delivered to the disciples the figure of his body." *Tom.* 8. *p.* 16.; language which would now be condemned by the Church of Rome for heresy. Austin was never accused of heresy, as Cardinal Perron says Origen was ; but he talks as like one as Origen himself. Speaking of the offence which some disciples took at the saying of our Saviour, " Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood," &c. he brings in our Saviour (*Tom.* 9. *p.* 1105.) as speaking thus to them ; " Ye must understand spiritually what I have said unto you ; ye are not to eat this body which ye see, and to drink that blood which shall be shed by those who shall crucify me. I have commanded a certain sacrament to you, which, being spiritually understood, will give you life." I do not pledge myself for the accuracy of the saint's exposition of our Lord's words as relating to a sacrament ; but his language certainly is not that of a man who believed in transubstantiation. Tillotson has a folio page of extracts from the same Father, all to the same purpose ; from which it appears that he had more Protestant-like views of the Lord's Supper than even Luther had, and approached nearer to the sentiments afterwards maintained by Calvin and Knox, and which are held by most Protestant churches at this day.

It is true that in the fifth century there were some heretics who taught something like transubstantiation ; but then the high authorities of the church, and even the Pope of that day, was against them. Thus Pope Gelasius writes against the Eutychians, (*Biblioth. Pat. Tom.* 4.) " Surely the sacraments which we receive of the body and blood of our Lord are a divine thing, so that by them we are made partakers of a divine nature, and yet it ceaseth not to be the substance or nature of bread and

wine; and certainly the image or resemblance of Christ's body and blood are celebrated in the action of the mysteries." Here is the infallible authority of a Pope against transubstantiation.

Facundus, an African Bishop of the sixth century writes, (page 144. edit. Par. 1676.) "And the sacrament of adoption may be called adoption, as the sacrament of his body and blood which is in the consecrated bread and cup, is by us called his body and blood: not that the bread is properly his body, and the cup his blood, but because they contain in them the mysteries of his body and blood; hence our Lord himself called the blessed bread and cup which he gave to the disciples his body and blood." Can any man believe after this, that it was then, and had ever been, the universal and received doctrine of the Christian church, that the bread and wine in the sacrament are substantially changed into the proper and natural body and blood of Christ?

These extracts, I hope, will be considered enough to show that transubstantiation was not always the doctrine of the Church of Rome. Scotus himself acknowledges that it was not always thought necessary to be believed; but that the necessity of believing it was consequent to that declaration of the church made in the Council of Lateran, under Pope Innocent III. (*In sent. l. 4. Dist. 11. Q. 3.*) that is, in plain English, the grave divine, Duns Scotus, did not believe the doctrine to rest on any higher authority than that of the said Lateran council, which was held, I believe, in the thirteenth century. And Durandus, another great authority in the Romish church, freely discovers his inclination "to have believed the contrary (of transubstantiation) if the church had not by that determination *obliged men to believe it.*" (*In sent. l. 4. Dist. 11. Q. 1. n. 15.*) Tonstal, Bishop of Durham, also confesses, that "before the Lateran Council men were at liberty as to the manner of Christ's presence in the sacrament." (*De Euchar. l. 1. p. 146.*) Erasmus, who lived and died in the communion of the Church of Rome, than whom no man was better read in the ancient Fathers, confesses that it was "late before the church defined transubstantiation," which was "unknown to the ancients both name and thing." *In 1 Cor. c. 7.*

Attend now to the particular time and occasion of the coming in of this doctrine; and by what steps and degrees it grew up, and was advanced into an article of faith in the Church of Rome. The doctrine of the corporeal presence of Christ was first started upon occasion of the dispute about the worship of images, in opposition to which the Synod of Constantinople about the year 750, argued thus: "That our Lord having left us no other image of himself but the sacrament, in which the substance of bread is the image of his body, we ought to make no other

image of our Lord." In answer to this argument, the second council of Nice, in the year 787, did declare, that the sacrament, after consecration, is not the image and antitype of Christ's body and blood, but is properly his body and blood. So that the corporeal presence of the body of Christ in the sacrament, was first brought in to support the stupid worship of images : and indeed it could never have come in upon a more proper occasion, or have been applied to a fitter purpose. *Tillotson, p. 276.*

The above refers to the introduction of the doctrine of the real presence into the Greek church ; and in the Latin or Roman church, it was first broached by the monk, Paschasius, afterwards abbot of Corbey, in the year 818. In reference to whom, Bellarmine writes, (*De Scriptor Eccles.*) " This author was the first who hath seriously and copiously written concerning the truth of Christ's body and blood in the Eucharist." Thus, by the confession of the great and learned Cardinal, it was about 800 years after Christ, before any author wrote seriously and copiously about the real presence. This must have been because, before that period, no author seriously believed it, or ever thought of it ; for long before that period there were many voluminous authors upon every subject connected with religion.

But the doctrine was not generally received for a long period after it was broached. Rabanus Maurus, Archbishop of Mentz, about the year 847, reciting the very words of Paschasius, wherein he delivered the doctrine of the real presence, says concerning the novelty of it ;—" Some, of late, not having a right opinion concerning the sacrament of the body and blood of our Lord, have said, that this is the body and blood of our Lord, which was born of the Virgin Mary, and in which our Lord suffered upon the cross, and rose from the dead ; which error we have opposed with all our might." (*Epist. ad Heribaldum, c. 33.*)

In the year 1059, great opposition was made to the doctrine in France and Germany, by Berengarius ; who was compelled to recant his opposition, and profess his faith, in these words :—" That the bread and wine which are set upon the altar, after the consecration, are not only the sacrament, but the true body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ ; and are sensibly, not only in the sacrament, but in truth, handled and broken by the hands of the priest, and ground or bruised by the teeth of the faithful." But it seems the Pope and his council were not then skilful enough to express themselves rightly in this matter ; for the gloss upon the canon law says expressly, " That unless we understand these words of Berengarius, (that is, the words which the Pope and his council compelled him to speak,) in a sound sense, we shall fall into a greater heresy than that of Berengarius ; for we

do not make parts of the body of Christ." The meaning of which gloss, says my author, I cannot imagine, unless it be this, that the body of Christ, though it be in truth broken, yet it is not broken into *parts*, but into *wholes*. Now, this new way of breaking a body, not into parts, but into wholes (which in good earnest is the doctrine of the Church of Rome), though to them that are able to believe transubstantiation, it may, for any thing I know, appear to be sound sense, yet to us who cannot believe so, it appears to be solid nonsense.

About twenty years after, in the year 1079, Pope Gregory VII. began to be sensible of this absurdity; and therefore in another council at Rome, made Berengarius to recant in another form, viz. That the bread and wine which are placed upon the altar, are substantially changed into the true, and proper, and quickening, flesh and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and, after consecration, are the true body of Christ, which was born of the Virgin, and which being offered for the salvation of the world, did hang upon the cross, and sits at the right hand of the Father.

So that, from the first starting of this doctrine in the second council of Nice, in the year 787, till the council under Pope Gregory VII. in 1079, it was almost three hundred years that this doctrine was contested, and before the mis-shapen monster of transubstantiation could be licked into that form in which it is now settled and established in the Church of Rome. Here, then, is a plain account of the first rise of this doctrine, and of the several steps whereby it was advanced by the Church of Rome into an article of faith.

I recommend the whole discourse of the worthy Primate to all who have access to it. It contains the best exposure of the doctrine of transubstantiation, and the most condensed history of it, that has come in my way. He and his colleagues, Chillingworth and Stillingfleet, were such great literary and controversial giants, as to make all the mighty men of Rome appear as mere children when they came into contact with them. If the Church of England in the present day, possessed many such worthies, I should have fewer fears of her falling away towards Rome: But where shall we find champions equal to this *first three*?

I hope it will appear from the preceding, that I have proved the point with which I set out in the present Number, that the holy Council of Trent were guilty of a barefaced falsehood, in asserting that transubstantiation was always believed in the church. It is, in fact, a mere mushroom novelty of the dark ages, which would never have taken root, or grown to maturity, but in a rank and filthy soil, on which the light of truth was not permitted to shine.

THE

Protestant,

No. LVIII.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 21st, 1819.

WHEN Christ spoke of his flesh being "meat indeed, and his blood drink indeed," he evidently meant the doctrine concerning his death as an atoning sacrifice for sin. Some of his followers, affecting to understand him to speak of literally eating his flesh, were offended by it; and he, knowing that they had taken offence, and the cause of their doing so, condescended to explain his meaning. "It is the Spirit," said he, "that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing; the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit and they are life." John vi. 63. Thus he told the people plainly, that he was not speaking of his flesh literally; it was not this which they were to eat; it could not profit them as food; but it was his words, that is, his doctrine, which by the divine Spirit was made instrumental in giving life to the soul of every one that believed it. But the Church of Rome will have it, that Christ meant what he declared he did not mean. They deny the spiritual meaning of his words; and they profess really and literally to eat his flesh, and drink his blood, into which, they say, the bread and wine upon the altar are converted, when the priest pronounces the words of consecration.

This conversion, they say, is so entire, that nothing whatever of the substance of bread and wine remains after pronouncing the mysterious words. The form and appearance, they admit, remain as before, but the whole substance is converted into the body and blood, soul and divinity, of Jesus Christ. Therefore, whatever may have been mixed up with the bread and the wine before consecration, however deleterious in itself, can do no harm to him that receives it. The following anecdote, which many of my readers may have seen in the public journals, will illustrate what I mean.

"A Protestant lady entered the matrimonial state with a Roman Catholic gentleman, on condition he would never use any attempts, in his intercourse with her, to induce her to embrace his religion. Accordingly, after their marriage, he abstained from conversing with her on those religious topics which he knew would be disagreeable to her. He employed the Romish priest, however, who often visited the family, to use his influence to instil his popish notions into her mind. But she remained unmoved, particularly on the doctrine of transubstantiation. At length the husband fell ill, and, during his affliction, was recommended by the priest to receive the Holy Sacrament. The wife was requested to prepare bread and wine for the solemnity, by the next day. She did so; and on presenting them to the priest, said, "These, Sir, you wish me to understand, will be changed into the real body and blood of Christ, after you have consecrated them." "Most certainly," he replied. "Then, Sir," she rejoined, it will not be possible, after the consecration, for them to do any harm to the worthy partakers; for, says our Lord, "my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed;" and "he that eateth me shall live by me." "Assuredly," answered the priest, "they cannot do harm to the worthy receivers, but must communicate great good." The ceremony was proceeded in, and the bread and wine were consecrated; the priest was about to take and eat the bread; but the lady begged pardon for interrupting him, adding, "I mixed a little arsenic with the bread, Sir, but as it is now changed into the real body of Christ, it cannot of course do *you* any harm." The principles of the priest, however, were not sufficiently firm to enable him to eat it. Confused, ashamed, and irritated, he left the house, and never more ventured to enforce on the lady the absurd doctrine of transubstantiation."

Whether this anecdote be literally true, in all its circumstances, or not, is of little importance to the argument. It may be realized by any person, at any time; and it may be used very fairly to put any Papist to the test as to his belief in transubstantiation. I have no wish to get rid of any of my opponents, else I would advise them to make the experiment. If the priest's words, *Hoc est corpus meum*, should have the power of expelling the arsenic, as well as the flour and water, from the consecrated wafer, I will acknowledge a miracle; and perhaps some worthy Papist may have the courage to run the risk of being poisoned, for the sake of converting such a heretic. But I would not trust a Papist with the making of the wafer; I would have it made by such a Protestant as the Lady above mentioned.

The entire substance of the wine being converted into the substance of the blood of Christ, it follows, of course, that nothing of an intoxicating quality remains; but as the priest takes the

whole to himself, and drinks it off; every time he gives the sacrament, though it were fifty times in a day, there is some risk of the wine letting out the secret of its own substance, by its effects upon the brain of the priest; and this would no doubt often be the case, were it not well diluted with water.

When the priest, by the mysterious words, has produced what the Council of Trent calls the wonderful conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the substance of the body of Christ, the first thing to be done is, to fall down and worship. To worship what? Any man who trusts his senses, I had almost said, any man in his senses, would answer, The wafer, or bit of bread, which the priest holds up for the purpose of being adored; and this leads unavoidably to the conclusion, that such worshippers are guilty of direct and gross idolatry. But Papists consider themselves greatly injured, misrepresented, and insulted, when they are accused of this; and they are incessantly accusing Protestants of bigotry and illiberality, because we will not renounce the evidence of our senses as they do theirs, and because we will not grant them, that what we see to be a wafer is the God that made us.

They maintain that God alone is the object that they worship; but they do not deny that he appears to their eyes in the form of a wafer. This is the image by which they represent their God; but they spurn at the idea of his being what he appears to be. I shall give here, in their own words, the doctrine which they disavow, together with that which they do avow. I quote from the work entitled, "The Papist misrepresented and represented," by Gother, which is a work of high authority, and in great esteem among English Papists, having been republished by the late Dr. Challoner, Bishop of Debra, and Vicar Apostolic in the London district.

"*Of the Eucharist.*—The Papist misrepresented, believes it lawful to commit idolatry, and makes it his daily practice to worship and adore a breaden God, giving divine honour to those poor, empty elements of bread and wine. Of these he asks pardon for his sins; of these he desires grace and salvation; these he acknowledges to have been his Redeemer and Saviour, and hopes for no good but what is to come to him by means of these household gods. And then for his apology, he alleges such gross contradictions, so contrary to all sense and reason, that whosoever will be a Papist, must be no man: fondly believing, that what he adores is no bread or wine, but Christ really present under these appearances; and thus makes as many Christs, as many Redeemers, as there are churches, altars, or priests. When, according to God's infallible word, there is but one Christ, and he not on earth, but at the right hand of his Father in heaven.

"The Papist truly represented, believes it abominable to commit any kind of idolatry; and most damnable to worship or adore

a breaden god, or to give divine honour to the elements of bread and wine. He worships only one God, who made heaven and earth, and his only Son Jesus Christ our Redeemer; who being in all things equal to his Father in truth and omnipotency, he believes made his words good, pronounced at his last supper; really giving his body and blood to his Apostles; the substance of bread and wine being by his powerful words changed into his own body and blood, the species or appearances of bread and wine remaining as before. The same he believes of the most holy sacrament of the Eucharist, consecrated now by priests; that it really contains the body of Christ, which was delivered for us; and his blood, which was shed for the remission of our sins: which being there united with the divinity, he confesses whole Christ to be present. And him he adores and acknowledges his Redeemer, and not any bread and wine. And for the believing of this mystery, he does not at all think it meet for any Christian to appeal from Christ's words to his own senses or reason, for the examining the truth of what he has said, but rather to submit his senses and reason to Christ's words, in the obsequiousness of faith: and that, being the son of Abraham, it is more becoming him to believe as Abraham did, promptly, with a faith superior to all sense or reason, and whether these could never lead him," &c.—the author then goes on to argue the matter at great length; endeavouring to show that it is with this faith that we believe every mystery of religion, as the Trinity, incarnation, &c.; but the above is the substance of his faith "truly represented" in opposition to "the Papist misrepresented."

Now, let any one carefully examine both the misrepresentation and the representation, and he will find them substantially the same. The misrepresenter gives the truth according to the evidence of his own senses. He sees a Papist paying divine honour to what he sees and knows to be nothing but a piece of bread. He calls this idolatry; and he does so truly, according to the evidence of his own senses, and the authority of the Bible, which declares idolatry to be the giving of divine worship to any thing that is not God. He knows that the bread is a mere creature, the workmanship of human hands; and therefore he does, and cannot but consider the adoration paid to it as the grossest idolatry. The representer, after disclaiming idolatry as abominable and damnable, proceeds to tell us, that Papists do the very thing of which we accuse them; but then it is not idolatry, because the bread and wine are not bread and wine, but the real body and blood of Christ, united to his divinity; and him they worship under the appearances of bread and wine. Now, every one who does not believe that the bread and wine are really converted into the body and blood of Christ, does, and cannot, without renouncing his own senses and reason, do otherwise than

consider the Papists as worshipping the "empty elements," as Gother calls them. In short, let them say what they will, we must take them for downright idolaters, unless we make them a surrender of our senses and reason, which I would be loath to do, at least till they have learned to make a better use of their own.

The argument from the faith of Abraham is nothing to the purpose. It is not said that he believed any thing contrary to his reason or his senses. He did indeed believe the word of God in relation to a thing which was out of the ordinary course of nature, as all miracles were. But the effect of divine power was made palpable to his senses at the time it was promised to be; whereas, "the Papist truly represented," believes a thing that never was, and never can be palpable, but is directly contrary to his senses.

Besides, it is not true that transubstantiation rests upon the same evidence as the real mysteries of our religion; such as the doctrine of the Trinity, the incarnation, &c. These are plainly revealed in the word of God, which transubstantiation is not; and there can be nothing more reasonable than to believe what God has said, though we cannot understand how it should be. In point of fact, however, God has said nothing that is contrary to our reason, or to the evidence of our senses. The Bible contains all that he has to say to human creatures till the day of judgment; and I defy the world to prove that it contains any thing contrary to sense and reason. It does, indeed, make known things which human reason cannot reach, and things which cannot be subjected to the scrutiny of human senses: but on this very account it is impossible to show that such things are *contrary* to reason and sense. We must have the perfect understanding of a thing before we can pronounce it contrary to sense and reason; but we have not such understanding of the doctrine of the Trinity; we cannot say it is unreasonable; and we have nothing to do but to believe what God has revealed on the subject. But transubstantiation does come within the sphere of our senses. They are as capable of judging of it as of any thing which we see, or hear, or touch, or taste, or smell; and since by the evidence of four of these five senses, we know bread to be bread, and wine to be wine, it is impossible for us to believe that they are any thing else.

Papists, having made a god of a little flour and water, and having adored the work of their hands, the next step in the process of absurdity and impiety is to eat the idol. This, it must be allowed, has no parallel among the most savage heathen tribes. "How many gods are there?" said a Popish missionary to a young heathen convert. "None," replied the youth. "None! you fool, what do you mean?" "I mean," said the raw Papist, "that there is no God, for you told me that there was only one, and I ate him yesterday." It is painful to be obliged to speak with an

air of levity on such a subject : but the believers and advocates of the monstrous absurdity of transubstantiation must answer for it. I believe it is as lawful to ridicule the breadden god of the Papists, as it was for the prophet Elijah to mock the god of Jezebel and the idolatrous Israelites.

Dr. Middleton, who has traced many of the Popish rites up to their heathen original, frankly confesses that he can find nothing in heathenism equal to the Popish adoration of the host and their subsequent eating of it. "As to that celebrated act of Popish idolatry," says he, "the adoration of the host, I must confess that I cannot find the least resemblance of it in any part of the pagan worship: and as oft as I have been standing at Mass, and seen the whole congregation prostrate on the ground, in the humblest posture of adoring, at the elevation of this consecrated piece of bread; I could not help reflecting on a passage of Tully, where, speaking of the absurdity of the heathens in the choice of their gods, he says "Was any man ever so mad, as to take that which he feeds upon for a god?" (*Cic. de nat. Deor.* 3.) This was an extravagance left for Popery alone; and what an old Roman could not but think too gross, even for Egyptian idolatry to swallow, is now become the principal part of worship, and the distinguished article of faith, in the creed of modern Rome." page 179.

The above sentence from Cicero, (*Ecquem tam amentem esse putas, qui illud, quo vescatur, Deum credat esse?*) is taken as a motto by a spirited writer of some letters in the Morning Post, under the signature of PHILOPATRIS. With the following extracts from which I shall conclude the present Number.

"SIR, The great and enlightened moralist, who made the observation which I have prefixed to this, and two former letters, could never have become a Christian on the terms of Popery. If he had lived in *Papal Rome*, instead of Pagan Rome, he must have suffered at the stake (as Lord Cobham, Latimer, Cranmer, Ridley, and other pious and good men did in *Papal Britain*) for denying the doctrine of transubstantiation. What a revolution in the history of human intellect is such a declension from Pagan light to Christian darkness *in the same capital*! But indeed I ought not to call it *Christian* darkness; because the doctrine of transubstantiation is no part of Christianity.

"It is, nevertheless, one of the most distinguishing tenets of the Romish church. In Queen Mary's days, it was a test of *heresy*. In a Protestant church, it is a test of *Popery*. It is the spear of Ithuriel that unmasks all disguises. A declaration against the *doctrine* of transubstantiation, is a much surer declaration against Popery, than a simple renunciation of the *term* Papist; or than any verbal acknowledgment of the king's supremacy.

"The declaration against transubstantiation pronounces the

doctrine to be idolatrous; and so our statute and ecclesiastical law declare it. It is the language of a Protestant country. But some liberal and charitable minds object to this language, because they say, it hurts the moral feelings of the Roman Catholics. But must we sacrifice our principles to feeling, our faith to charity, our Protestant character to liberality? Do we find in the writings of Gandolphy, or Dr. Milner, or Dr. Drumgold, or of the Irish Bishops, or of the present Pope, any such tenderness for Protestants—especially the Protestants of the church of England?"—*Morning Post of June 7th, 1819.*

"SIR, I cannot yet part with my motto, it says so much and so well, in so small a compass. Besides, the judgment of an *ancient Roman* upon the idolatry of *modern Rome*, in taking that for God, which is not God, is such a coincidence—such an instance of almost prophetic anticipation—as may have a providential influence on the minds of Roman Catholics, which are at all open to the dictates of right reason.

"In a political point of view, the most decisive objections to Lord Grey's bill, for the repeal of the declaration against transubstantiation and Popery, appear to be these. In the *first* place, the subject has been, in effect, already decided in both houses of Parliament, in the present session. For, when Parliament decided against the eligibility of Roman Catholics to a seat in the Legislature, it, in effect, decided against the repeal of securities which alone keep them out of Parliament.

"In the *next* place, the Act of Union with Scotland has guaranteed the perpetuity of the Protestant religion, as by law established, that is, as established by those securities which Lord Grey's bill proposes to abrogate. Those securities cannot, I conceive, be repealed without the consent of the church of Scotland. And the church of Scotland having no representatives in either house of Parliament, and therefore taking no share in the discussion of the subject, is a distinct party, and deeply interested, whose consent ought to be obtained, before the securities for the maintenance of the Protestant religion ought to be abrogated. The church of Scotland has already petitioned (in 1813) against innovating upon the laws which uphold our Protestant constitution."

The reader will see that PHILOPATRIS is going more into the political question of "Catholic emancipation" than I choose to go; but these extracts contain some information on the subject which may be useful. "As to the religious view of the subject," says this writer, "it is alleged that the oaths and declaration related to mere speculative doctrines, and dogmatical opinions. The merely speculative character of the doctrines protested against in the declaration, does not lessen their importance, as a test of Popery. They are essential articles of the

Papal creed, and are its most distinguishing tenets; and, as such, the fittest that could have been chosen to distinguish Papists from Protestants.

"But it is objected, that some Protestants do not believe the doctrines to be idolatrous, which are the subject of the declaration (i. e. transubstantiation and the invocation of saints.) To this it may be answered, that, so far as they do not consider the said doctrines to be idolatrous, they dissent from the principles of the Reformation, and are, so far, not Protestants. If they do not see the idolatry of the doctrines, it must be for want of inquiry. What says the light of nature? *Do you think that any one is so insane as to believe that which he eats is a God?* What says the honest conviction of our own reason? That an Infinite Being cannot be circumscribed, whole and entire, within the compass of a wafer. What says the word of God? It says nothing that, in the smallest degree, warrants the doctrine, that a priest has the miraculous power of converting bread into an immaterial being; or that any thing which he can make with the breath of his mouth, can be a proper object of divine worship. Transubstantiation, therefore, is, as the declaration pronounces it to be, an idolatrous doctrine. And so it is declared to be by all the great lights of the Reformation, from WICKLIFFE to JEWELL, especially by those holy men who died for their protest against it." *Morning Post*, June 9th, 1819.

The same writer gives, in the *Morning Post* of June 10th, the following curious document: it is part of an address by the Parliament to King James I. "From these causes, as bitter roots, we humbly offer to your Majesty, that we foresee and fear there will necessarily follow very dangerous effects both to church and state. For (1) The Popish religion is incompatible with ours in respect to their positions. (2) It draweth with it an unavoidable dependency on foreign princes. (3) It openeth too wide a gap for popularity to any who shall draw too great a party. (4) It has a *restless spirit*, and will strive by these gradations; if it once get but a *connivance*, it will press for a *toleration*; if that should be obtained, they must have an *equality*; from thence they will aspire to *superiority*; and will never rest till they get a subversion of true religion."

From the above, the reader will perceive, that the Parliament of King James knew the true character of Popery much better than some of our present senators do; and it is pretty evident, that Papists, having now for a long time enjoyed the most liberal toleration, are aiming at an equality, and a place in the Legislature, only as a stepping-stone to that superiority which they all have in their eye, and which, when they have obtained, they will employ for the extirpation of all heretics.

THE

Protestant,

No. LIX.

SATURDAY, AUGUST 28th, 1819.

IT often happens that I receive interesting letters from correspondents, on subjects which I have just handled, and which would have furnished useful hints, had I received them before entering upon the discussion, or even in the course of it; but when I have finished what I intended to write on a particular topic, it is not always convenient to return to it, even when new and useful matter has been suggested.

The concluding paragraph of my 56th Number, in which I observed that I would not take the word of a believer in transubstantiation for the identity of any person or thing in the world, has led a gentleman who subscribes himself "ARMIGER OLIM," but who has also given me his real name, to address me a letter, of which I shall extract only that part which relates to transubstantiation, as I have not yet done with that subject. "Before I finish this short note," says he, "I shall detail the preached sentiments of a very respectable dignitary of the Romish church in this kingdom, whom I heard preach upon the subject, within these six months. From the service of the day read at the altar, he was led to address the congregation on the subject of transubstantiation. After treating the immortal Luther, at least, with no great respect, he strongly put the question to the separatists as to the blessing of the priest not turning the bread and wine into the very body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, thus:—'Are they sure their senses do not deceive them in this respect?'" meaning, I suppose, that it may be a defect in the senses of Protestants, which disables them from seeing the real body, &c. in the elements; at least the

question is put as if it were possible that our senses may be so deceived. "Upon stating this to a friend," says my correspondent, "he observed, 'Then I may shoot a man, and maintain that my senses impressed me with an idea that a grouse was before me. It would be a curious circumstance, if such a case were to come before the Lord Justice-Clerk of Scotland, or any other judge; and if the pannel were to plead such an excuse for his conduct. We may easily imagine how any virtuous and upright judge would be affected by such a plea; what abhorrence it would excite in the whole court; and in what a light transubstantiation would appear, when it was found to open a door for the commission of the greatest crimes. If men suffer their senses so to deceive them, what confidence could they have in a signature to a bill, the deposition of a witness in any case, civil or criminal, the purchase of an estate, or the solemn act of infestment, or its record, well known in the Scotch law, as matters of the highest importance to the security of our lives and property?'"

A writer, whom I quoted in my last Number, has justly remarked, that transubstantiation is one of the most distinguishing tenets of the Church of Rome. Among Papists, it is a test of heresy, for none but a heretic would refuse to swallow it; and among Protestants, it is a test of Popery, for no true Papist will renounce or disavow it. They will quibble about many other points, and even deny some things that really belong to their church; but they hold most tenaciously the most absurd and wicked of them all; for I can imagine nothing more absurd and wicked than the doctrine in question, and its necessary consequences. If, therefore, it be necessary to have a test, in order to know who are Papists and who are not, there seems to be nothing so fit for the purpose as transubstantiation. To try them on this point is to bring them to *the test*.

Absurd and wicked as the doctrine is, there is nobody in this country allowed to molest them on account of it. They are allowed to hold and teach it as freely as any man is allowed to hold and teach the plainest truths of the gospel. But how stands the matter in Popish countries, with regard to those who do not believe in transubstantiation? This is a proof of heresy, and nothing more is necessary to send a man to the flames. It was so in England in Queen Mary's time, and there can be no doubt it will be so again, if ever Papists shall obtain the power and ascendancy which they are aiming at.

Speaking of transubstantiation, Dr. Tillotson remarks:—"It is scandalous also, on account of the cruel and bloody consequences of this doctrine; so contrary to the plain laws of Christianity, and to one great end and design of this sacrament, which

is to unite Christians in the most perfect love and charity towards one another: Whereas this doctrine has been the occasion of the most barbarous and bloody tragedies that ever were acted in the world. For this has been, in the Church of Rome, the great *burning article*; and as absurd and unreasonable as it is, more Christians have been murdered for the denial of it, than perhaps for all the other articles of their religion. And I think it may generally pass for a true observation, that all sects are commonly most hot and furious for those things for which there is least reason; for what men want of reason for their opinions, they usually supply and make up with rage.”—“O blessed Saviour! thou best friend and greatest lover of mankind, who can imagine that thou didst ever intend that men should kill one another for not being able to believe contrary to their senses; for being unwilling to think that thou shouldst make one of the most horrid and barbarous things that can be imagined, a main duty and principal mystery of thy religion; for not flattering the pride and presumption of the priest who says he can make God, and for not complying with the folly and stupidity of the people who are made to believe that they can eat him?” *Sermons, folio, page 277.*

It is true, we do not hear of any persons having been put to death of late, under form of law, in Popish countries, for denying transubstantiation; but the reason is, that in countries thoroughly Popish, there are no persons to be found so courageous as to deny it. Let any one be so bold as to make the trial in Spain, within reach of the Inquisition, and we shall see what will be the consequence.

One thing is certain, that, of late years, the Protestants in France have suffered not a little, because they will not acknowledge the real presence of Christ in the consecrated wafer, and worship it as their Saviour. In all Popish countries it is the practice to carry the consecrated host in procession through the streets, in order to be administered to sick or dying persons in their own houses; and whoever happens to meet it must fall down on his knees and worship. If, in some instances, Englishmen are exempted, it is because they are Englishmen, not because they are Protestants; and even they are expected to show some mark of reverence, such as touching the hat, in honour of the idol.

On Corpus Christi day, it is the custom to carry the host about in solemn procession in great pomp; and though France be not so thoroughly Popish as Spain, Portugal, and Italy, yet all those who reside in the streets, through which the procession is to pass, are compelled to decorate their houses, in honour of the idol that is passing by. Now this is nothing less than to

compel persons to be guilty of idolatry; for whatever Papists themselves may think and believe upon the subject, those who are not Papists believe that what they are commanded to honour is not God, but a piece of bread; and to compel them to violate their consciences, by honouring in the smallest degree such an idol, is such direct persecution, that were Papists in this country subjected to the tenth part of the hardship, our own Protestant population would cry out against it, and they would justly do so, as a proceeding unknown and unwarranted by any principle of genuine Christianity.

I am aware, that by the constitutional charter, Protestants in France are relieved from the obligation of this idolatrous compliance; but many have been compelled to it notwithstanding; and others, on their refusal, have been exposed to vexations and sufferings innumerable.

It was lately stated, in some of the public papers, that the British Minister in Paris, had his house finely decorated on the octave of Corpus Christi day, in honour of the procession, that is, in honour of the great Popish idol.* This, if true, must have been a voluntary thing on his part; and no doubt some of our very *liberal* Protestants will consider it no more than a decent mark of respect for the established religion of the country in which he happened to reside; but for my part, I consider it no less than an act of gross idolatry; and as the person said to have been guilty of it, was a public character, and the representative of the Sovereign of Britain, I consider it no less than an act of national idolatry; and I shall continue to do so, until it be disclaimed by authority, and the guilty individual severely censured for his conduct.

I know there is a popular feeling in favour of small compliances with the religious practice of others, though not precisely

* The following is the paragraph extracted from the Glasgow Chronicle of June 29th, copied, I presume, from some of the London papers:—"On Sunday, being the octave of Corpus Christi day, the processions of the host were repeated in various districts of Paris; and Monsieur, Madame, and the Dukes of Angouleme and Berry, again appeared in the train of the faithful. The English Ambassador's Hotel was decorated with rich and magnificent tapestry on this occasion, a circumstance, which, according to the Parisian Journalists, excited general interest and delight. There was a period in our history when such a mark of respect by any of our representatives at foreign courts, to one of the most absurd and ridiculous descriptions of idolatry ever invented, would have called for serious animadversion on the part of the British Government. It cannot be supposed that he acted under compulsion; and his voluntary compliance cannot but prove truly disheartening to the French Protestants, many of whom have so recently remonstrated against their being subjected to this superstitious homage, as a violation of the rights of conscience, and an infringement of the constitutional charter."

what we would habitually practise ourselves. But, in matters of divine worship, there cannot be a *small* compliance, if it relate to any thing that diverts the mind from the only true God as the sole object of worship. Idolatry, in every form, is pointed out in the Bible as the object of divine displeasure and abhorrence; and it is not enough that a Christian should forbear the external practice of it: he must also regard it with abhorrence; he must not be seen in an idol's temple; he must not taste or touch what has been offered to an idol; much less must he show positive respect to an idol, which has been the sin of Britain, in the person of their representative: I mean if the fact be true, and I have never seen it contradicted.

What must the Protestants in France have thought of such a compliance on the part of the ambassador of a Protestant nation? Some of them were suffering the loss of all things rather than show the smallest respect to what they knew to be an idol. They considered Englishmen as their friends and their brethren, who, being of the same faith, would sympathise with them in their sufferings, and encourage them to be steadfast in their adherence to the truths of the Reformation, and in opposition to all idolatry. But here is the representative of a great, nay of the greatest Protestant power in the world, symbolizing with Popery in that very article, for non-compliance with which they suffered such persecution! Certainly this was calculated to depress them, and to encourage their persecutors to exercise greater severity. It furnished the persecutors with this strong argument, which they will not fail to make use of:—"It is nothing but unreasonable obstinacy on the part of you Protestants, that you will not do honour to the consecrated host; for seeing the British Ambassador does it, it cannot be contrary to the tenets of the Protestant religion." Thus, one Protestant may have given a deeper wound to the cause of true religion in France, than a thousand Papists could have done. There are doubtless many in that country, as there are in our own, who, though called Protestants, are not well grounded in the Protestant faith. Such will be encouraged to embrace Popery, when they see that a Protestant ambassador can voluntarily give his countenance to what they had been taught to consider idolatrous, and inconsistent with the Protestant religion. Those who are really Christians, and confirmed in the Protestant faith, will reason more correctly; but we ought to remember, that though every Papist is really what he professes to be, there are thousands of Protestants who are such only in name, and who are therefore ready to adopt any system that may suit their interest, or their convenience.

The following extract will show that there are Protestants

who make very light of the difference between themselves and Papists, even on the point of transubstantiation, and who, if they were to become Papists, would not have made a great transition. It is part of the speech of Earl Grey, in the House of Lords, on the 10th of June last, on the subject of repealing the act which requires of those admitted into office, a declaration against transubstantiation, and the invocation of saints. I quote from the Orthodox Journal for June, and the Editor professes to have taken it from the British Press newspaper:—

“But, my Lords, on a due examination of these declarations, are you ready to say, that the doctrines thus reviled, are idolatrous and superstitious? Do you know what is meant, in the Church of Rome, by the invocation of saints, or the adoration of the Virgin Mary? Are noble lords ready to point out those decisive reasons which led them to look on the sacrifice of the mass, and the doctrine of transubstantiation, as worthy of the vile epithets of idolatrous and superstitious? I believe most firmly, that some of those who have signed this test would not be competent to assign any reasons for holding the opinion which the test supposes to exist in the mind of the person agreeing to it. If there were no other cause, this calls on your Lordships to examine the nature of these tests. Can the doctrine of transubstantiation be, in any sense, idolatrous? What does the Roman Catholic believe, what does he adore? He believes the Deity to be transferred to the sacrament—and he adores, not an image, but what he believes to be the *real presence* of that Deity, to whom all adoration is due.—Can this worship be described as idolatrous? Or is it so widely different from the principles of our own church, that it must be contemned? Or is the text of Scripture, on which it is founded, so clear, that we must censure it as wrong? We may believe it wrong, but we ought to recollect, that the faith of the Roman Catholic is derived from the same source from which we have drawn our own, and its truth or error only one Being, all-wise, and all-perfect, can decide. This is of the more importance to be considered, because it is a point *most difficult* to decide. Let us look to the nature of the sacraments in which the Roman Catholic believes. He believes, as I have already stated, in transubstantiation,—he is convinced that he receives the *body of God* in the sacrament. The Lutheran believes the same thing, but in another form—what he terms consubstantiation. The Calvinist believes this doctrine also; but he, too, has his own modification—he believes that he receives the body and blood of Christ in some mysterious sense, which it is impossible to explain.” (I wish his Lordship had said where he got his views of Calvinism.) “Your Lordships, we of the Protestant church, un-

doubtedly condemn the doctrine of transubstantiation; but we believe that the body and blood of Christ is indeed perfectly taken by the faithful in the Lord's Supper. In all the churches I have mentioned, this doctrine is admitted: Queen Elizabeth undoubtedly believed in it—that the same doctrine was held by Archbishop Laud is indisputable—and many members of what is called the High Church, avowed a similar belief. What I wish to call your Lordships' attention to, is this—whether, on a point of such a nature, too high for the weakness of human nature to decide on, it is not too much for us to arrogate to ourselves the intentions of the Deity, and state what is the true or the false principle? In other words, declare that which can be known to Him, and to Him alone, from whom the gospel is derived? We may act on our own belief—we may act piously and even ardently on it, but we ought still to conduct ourselves with charity to all those who hold different opinions. It is surely most improper in us to use terms of reproach to the Roman Catholics, with respect to a point on which a great diversity of opinions prevails amongst Christians.”

I believe there are several sentiments in the above extract which will surprise my readers as coming from a Protestant nobleman. He puts the question, “Are you ready to say that the doctrines thus reviled are idolatrous and superstitious?” Most certainly, every Protestant would reply, if he had examined and understood the subject; and agreeably to an opinion expressed by a writer whom I quoted in my last, I believe that he who hesitates about the matter, be he what he may, is no Protestant. If there be any who have signed the test, or declaration against transubstantiation, and cannot assign a reason for it, it is the more shame; and it only shows that there are Protestants who do not know why they are so; and who are ready to go over to Rome, whenever it may serve a purpose.

It is not my intention to go over, and expose, all the absurdity which is contained in the above extract. It exposes itself to every one who understands the subject; and it is indeed so very absurd, that I am inclined to think it is not precisely the same as was spoken by the nobleman whose name it bears; but that it must have received a tinge of Popery from the medium through which it has passed; for, if I am not mistaken, “The British Press” is one of the London Journals which are in the interest of Rome, of which there are said to be at least half a dozen. If the extract do express the genuine sentiments of Earl Grey, I must consider him as teaching, that there is not, and that there never was, such a thing as idolatry in the world. “Can the doctrine of transubstantiation be, in any sense, idolatrous? What does the Roman Catholic believe, what does he adore? He

believes the Deity to be transferred to the sacrament, and he adores, not an image, but what he believes to be the real presence of the Deity, to whom all adoration is due." I shall not stay to expose the absurdity and impiety of the idea of Deity being "*transferred*;" but I wish to mark and reprobate the principle laid down by the speaker or his reporter, that if a person does not believe his worship to be idolatry, it is therefore not idolatry, though it be the adoration of a piece of bread. Upon this principle, I say, there never was such a thing as idolatry in the world; for where was the man that ever worshipped an idol, believing it to be an idol? It was because the Divinity was supposed to reside in an image, that the ancient heathen worshipped images; and it is because Papists believe that the Deity is transferred to a piece of bread, or to speak more correctly, that a piece of bread is converted into the Deity, that they worship it. And he that will say this is not idolatry, will acquit the children of Israel of idolatry, when they made and worshipped the golden calf; for they did not worship it as an idol, but because they supposed the Deity to reside in it. "These," said they, "be thy gods, O Israel, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt;" and the feast which they made on the occasion, they declared to be a feast, not to the calf, but to the Lord. But after all, it is neither the bread nor the Deity whom the noble speaker represents as the object of Popish worship. The Papist, he says, "adores not an image, but what he believes to be the real presence of the Deity." He worships the *real presence*; but what that is he does not say. If he worship the bread, because the Deity is present, he may as well worship every creature in the heavens, and in the earth, and in the waters under the earth.

I shall only add, that if it be the opinion of his Lordship, that it is a thing too high for human reason to decide, whether that which we see to be bread and wine, be really bread and wine, or whether they be not the God that made us, then he has a much lower opinion of human reason than any Calvinist I ever met with: And if his Lordship had the advantage of being acquainted with persons of this sect, he would find that they had no difficulty in explaining in what sense Christ is present, and received, in the sacrament.

THE

Protestant,

No. LX.

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 4th, 1819.

IN the days of bloody Queen Mary of England, there was no greater crime than to disbelieve the doctrine of transubstantiation. People were not secure although they were silent upon the subject, and lived at peace with their neighbours, without meddling with religion. They were often interrogated by authority with regard to their belief, and if this was found defective, they were instantly sent to the stake. The Queen hated her sister Elizabeth, and wished if possible to get her cut off; but her conduct was so uniformly correct that nothing of a criminal nature could be found against her. At last she was put to the test upon the "burning article", as Tillotson calls it; but she escaped the snare that was laid for her life in a very ingenious manner. "The common net at that time," says Sir Richard Baker, "for catching of Protestants, was the real presence; and this net was used to catch the lady Elizabeth: for being asked one time, what she thought of the words of Christ, *this is my body*, whether she thought it the true body of Christ that was in the sacrament? It is said, that after some pausing, she thus answered.

Christ was the word that spake it,
He took the bread and brake it;
And what that word did make it,
That I believe and take it.

Which, though it may seem but a slight expression, yet hath it more solidness than at first sight appears; at least it served her turn at that time to escape the net, which by a direct answer she could not have done." *Hume's Hist. Eng. vol. 6. chap. 7.*

But there were many who had neither their wits nor their rhymes so ready as the princess, afterwards Queen Elizabeth; and

who being caught in Mary's net, were doomed to the flames. More than a hundred years before this period, Wickliffe had taught the scriptural doctrine relating to the Lord's supper, and he offered publicly to defend it against every opponent. Great multitudes in different parts of England embraced his doctrine; and down to the period of the Reformation there continued not a few who disbelieved transubstantiation. The number was no doubt greatly increased by the time of Mary, so that when she cast her net in order to catch subjects for the fire, she seldom drew it back empty.

Before leaving this part of the subject, I shall show the means which were used in England to uphold the credit of the doctrine after it began to be shaken. "No intelligent reader of ecclesiastical history," says a writer in the *Dublin Christian Instructor* for July 1819, "needs to be informed of the frauds and lying expedients, to which the enemies of the truth and of its defenders resorted, to support the dominant corruptions and confirm the people in delusion. It may not be wholly useless, however, to relate one instance from many. After the condemnation of the doctrines of Wickliffe by the council mentioned above, (that is, a council which had been called by Courtney, Archbishop of Canterbury,) a sermon was preached at the church of Grey Friars, by a John Cunningham, a distinguished adversary of Wickliffe. At this sermon was present a Knight, named Cornelius Cloune, a great favourer of the doctrines of Wickliffe then condemned. To Wickliffe's doctrine concerning the sacrament, (says the legend, especially,) he was a devoted convert. The next day he went to the same church to hear mass, when, lo! at the breaking of the host, upon casting his eye towards the friar who happened to celebrate the mass, he saw his hands full of flesh, raw and bloody!! Amazed he called his squire to see the prodigy; but, lo! the squire, who had been a good catholic, and whose faith, therefore, needed no such miraculous confirmation, saw nothing more than usual. But wonderful still more, he saw in the middle of the third piece which was to be put into the chalice, the name Jesus Christ, written in letters of flesh, raw and bloody! The friar preached at Paul's Cross next day, told the story to the assembly, and the knight offered to attest the truth of it, by fighting any one who should question it."

The absurdity of transubstantiation might be enough of itself to expose it to the derision of the whole world; but its wickedness consists chiefly in the idolatry of which it is the foundation. The Church of Rome teaches her children to worship the consecrated bread, because they say it is converted into the body and blood, soul and divinity of Jesus Christ. In other words, they believe the bread to be converted into God; and as such they worship it

with divine honour; but if the bread be not God, but a mere lifeless creature, as every man who trusts to the evidence of his senses takes it to be, the Papist's believing it to be God, can neither make it God, nor save him from the charge of gross idolatry.

When speaking of the idolatry of worshipping the Virgin Mary, I gave some examples of the style of devotion in which she is addressed; and I shall now give some examples or specimens of prayers addressed to the holy sacrament. The following is from the Manual of Godly Prayers.—*Missal. Rom in solemn. corporis Christi*. "O God, which under the admirable sacrament, hast left unto us the memory of thy passion, grant, we beseech thee, that we may so worship the sacred mysteries of thy body and blood, that continually we may feel in us the fruit of thy redemption." This it will be allowed is not a prayer to the sacrament, but a prayer to God that he would enable them to worship the sacrament.

In the office of the "venerable sacrament," printed at Colen, 1591, are the following words, "O God, who wouldst have the glorious mystery of thy body and blood to remain with us; grant, we pray thee, that we may so worship thy corporal presence on earth, that we may be worthy to enjoy the vision of it in heaven." I suppose the reporter of Lord Grey's speech, of which I gave an extract in my last Number, must have been thinking of such a prayer as the above, when he made his lordship represent Papists as worshipping the *presence* of the deity. This prayer lets us into the secret of what Papists expect from the object of their worship in answer to their prayers: it is not pardon and salvation for the sake of Christ, who alone is *worthy*; but that they themselves may be made *worthy* to enjoy the vision of God in heaven: and this worthiness is to be acquired by worshipping his corporal presence on earth. Though there were nothing else than cherishing this notion of self-worthiness, or self-righteousness to be objected against Popery, this alone would prove the system to be opposed to the whole doctrine of Christ.

The same work contains the following:—"O God, who in memory of thy passion didst wonderfully change bread and wine into thy body and blood; mercifully grant, that we who believe thy corporal presence in the venerable sacrament, may be brought to the beholding the appearance of thy highness."

The Roman Missal contains the following, by St. Thomas Aquinas, in Latin rhyme: I shall give only a few lines of the original, to shew the structure of the verse.

Adoro te devote latens deitas,
Quæ sub his figuris vere latitas
Tibi se cor meum totum subjicit,
Quia te contemplans totum deficit, &c.

" I devoutly adore thee, O latent Deity,
 Who under these figures truly liest hid.
 My heart submits itself wholly to thee,
 For when it contemplates thee, it wholly fails me.
 Sight, taste, and touch, is deceived in thee,
 Hearing alone a man may safely trust.
 Whatsoever the Son of God said, I believe.
 Nothing is truer than this word of truth.
 The Deity only on the cross was hid,
 Here the humanity also is concealed :
 But both believing, and confessing both,
 I ask what the repenting thief desired.
 I do not see, as Thomas did, thy wounds,
 Yet I acknowledge thee to be my God.
 O make me still more to believe in thee,
 On thee to place my hope, and thee to love.
 O thou memorial of my dying Lord,
 Thou living bread, and giving life to men,
 Grant that my soul, on thee may ever live,
 And thou to it mayst always sweetly taste.

The same angelic doctor writes of the sacrament as follows.
 It is a hymn for the feast of Corpus Christi.

Docti Sacris institutis,
 Panem vinum in salutis
 Consecramus hostiam
 Dogma datur Christianis,
 Quod in carnem transit panis.
 Et vinum in sanguinem, &c.

" Being taught by holy lessons, we consecrate bread and wine for a saving host. It is a maxim to Christians, that bread is changed into flesh, and wine into blood. What thou dost not comprehend, or see, a strong faith confirms, besides the order of nature. Precious things lie hid under different species, which are signs only, not things. The flesh is meat, and the blood drink, yet Christ remains whole under each kind. Uncut, unbroken, undivided, he is received whole by him that takes him. When a thousand take him, one takes as much as they; nor is he consumed in taking. The good and the bad both take him, but their lot is unequal in life and death. He is death to the bad, and life to the good; behold an unlike end of a like thing. When the sacrament is broken, be not staggered, but remember, there is as much in a particle as the whole covers. Here is no division of the thing, only a breaking of the sign; whereby neither the state nor stature of the thing signified is diminished."

To those who would inquire how this can be? the following answer is furnished, in another hymn for Corpus Christi day :

" What never yet was understood,
 Nor ever seen by any creature,
 A confident belief makes good,
 Though cross to all the laws of nature.

“ Though sense will not be brought to allow it,
 A heart sincere may be secure,
 And, waving all its scruples, sure,
 Since faith alone's enough to do it;
 For faith supplies the senses' want,
 And makes good measure where that's scant.”

In the Manual of Godly Prayers, there is another hymn by the same saint, which is in English as follows :

“ At his last supper made by night
 He with his brethren takes his seat,
 And having kept the ancient rite,
 Using the laws prescribed meat,
 His twelve disciples doth invite,
From his own hands himself to eat.
 The word made flesh, to words imparts
 Such strength, that bread himself is made,
 He wine into his blood converts:
 And if our sense here fail and fade,
 To satisfy religious hearts
 Faith only can the truth persuade.

Then to this sacrament so high,
 Low reverence let us now direct ;
 Old rites must yield in dignity
 To this, with such great graces deckt ;
 And faith will all those wants supply,
 Wherein the senses feel defect.”

Again:

“ O saving host, that open'st heaven's door
 Th' arms of our foes do us inclose,
 Thy strength we need ; O help with speed,
 We humbly thee implore.”

Such are the prayers of Papists to a piece of bread, the work of the baker.*

* *The following is translated from a satirical Poem of George Buchanan.*

A Baker and a Painter once contended which of them could produce the best specimen of his art ;—whether the former would excel with his oven, or the latter with his colours. The Painter boasted, that he had made a god ; the Baker replied, it is I who make the true body of God, thou only canst produce an image or representation of it. The Painter said thy god is always consumed by men's teeth ; thine, rejoined the Baker, is corroded by worms. The Painter affirmed, that one of his making would endure entire for many years, while an innumerable quantity of the Baker's would be often devoured in an hour. But you, said the Baker can scarcely paint one god in a year, while I can produce ten thousand in an hour.

Stop, said a Priest, and contend no more with words to no purpose, neither of your gods can do any thing without me ; and seeing it is I that make each of them a god, both shall be subservient to me : for the picture shall beg for me, and the bread be eaten by me.

There was published at Paris, with the approbation of three doctors of the faculty there, in 1669, a little book in French, called, "Pratique pour adorer le tres saint Sacrement de l'Autel:" Or, a Form for the adoration of the most holy sacrament of the altar; which begins thus: Praised and adored be the most holy sacrament of the altar; and then adds:

"Whosoever shall say these holy words, (Praised be the most holy sacrament of the altar), shall gain a hundred days of indulgences; and he that does reverence, hearing them repeated, as much. He that, being confessed, and having communicated, shall say the above-said words, shall gain a plenary indulgence; and the first five times that he shall say them, after his having confessed and communicated, he shall deliver five of his friends' souls, whom he pleases, out of Purgatory."

Then follows the form for honouring the holy sacrament, consisting of two prayers, as follow: (I give the English only.) The first of them has this rubric before it, in the hours of Salisbury. "Our holy Father, Pope John XXII., hath granted to all them that devoutly say this prayer, after the elevation of our Lord Jesus Christ, three thousand days of pardon for deadly sins."

Soul of Christ, sanctify me.
 Body of Christ, save me.
 Blood of Christ, inebriate me.*
 Water of Christ's side, wash me.
 Passion of Christ, comfort me.
 O good Jesus, hear me.
 Within thy wounds hide me.
 Suffer me not to be separated from thee.
 From the malicious enemy defend me.
 In the hour of death call me;
 And command me to come to thee,
 That with thy saints I may praise thee
 For evermore. Amen.

At the elevation of the Mass.

All hail, true body, born of the blessed Virgin Mary;
 Truly suffered, and offered upon the cross for mankind:
 Whose side, pierced with a spear, yielded water and blood.
 Vouchsafe to be received of us in the hour of death.

O good, O Jesu, Son of the blessed Virgin, have mercy on me.

Let it be observed, all this is addressed to the bread upon the altar, which the Papist is taught to believe is really his Saviour. After the above, the French form adds what follows:

"These two good prayers were found in the sepulchre of our Lord Jesus Christ in Jerusalem; and whosoever carries them

* It seems they wish the substance of the wine to remain after all.

about with him with devotion, and in honour of our Lord Jesus Christ, shall be delivered from the devil and from sudden death, and shall not die an ill death. He shall be preserved from pestilence, and all infectious diseases. No sorcery, or sorcerer, shall be able to hurt him or her that has these two good prayers about them. The fire from heaven shall not fall upon the house where these prayers are rehearsed with devotion. A woman with child saying them devoutly, shall be brought to bed, without any danger of her own, or her child's death. Lightnings and thunders shall not fall upon the houses where these prayers are rehearsed with devotion. Such a one shall not die without confession, and God will give him grace to repent of his sins."

It is easy to see the pernicious tendency of such doctrine, not only as cherishing idolatry and superstition, but encouraging men to live in all the wickedness to which their hearts may be inclined; seeing they are assured, that by the use of a few words, now and then, they shall not die without grace to repent of their sins.

I shall conclude these specimens of Popish devotion with the Litany of the holy sacrament, from the Manual of Godly Prayers :—

Living bread that didst descend from heaven
 God hidden and my Saviour
 Bread corn of the elect
 Wine budding from virgins
 Fat bread, and the delight of kings
 Continual sacrifice
 Pure oblation
 Lamb without spot
 Most pure table
 Food of angels
 Hidden manna
 Memorial of God's wonderful works
 Supersubstantial bread
 Word made flesh and dwelling in us
 Holy host
 Chalice of benediction
 Mystery of faith
 Most high and venerable sacrament
 Sacrifice of all other most holy
 Truly propitiatory for the quick and dead
 Heavenly antidote whereby we are preserved from sin
 Miracle above all others astonishing
 Most sacred commemoration of our Lord's death
 Gift surpassing all fulness
 Chief memorial of divine love
 Abundance of divine bounty
 Holy and most majestic mystery
 Medicine of immortality
 Dreadful and life-giving sacrament
 Bread by the words omnipotence made flesh

Have mercy upon us.

Unbloody sacrifice
 Meat and guest
 Most sweet banquet, whereat the ministering angels attend
 Sacrament of piety
 Bond of charity
 Offerer and oblation
 Spiritual sweetness tasted in its proper fountain
 Reflection of holy souls
 Viaticum of those who die in the Lord
 Pledge of future glory

Have mercy upon us.

It must be allowed that there is a great deal of apparent fervour here. Papists seem really in earnest in devotion to their idol, which they call the holy sacrament; but it is the earnestness and fervour of a nurse, who labours to silence a petulant and peevish child, by giving it many fine names without much meaning.

I am indebted for most of these extracts, and some of the remarks, to a work intitled, "The Popish Doctrine concerning the Sacraments refuted," in volume second of the "Preservative from Popery," title vii, by Dr. Stillingfleet, and other eminent divines of the seventeenth century. I shall conclude the present Number, with an extract from title vii. chap. v. of this work, which shows the practice of the Church of Rome as it corresponds with their doctrine.

"Having considered the adoration of the host as it is taught in the Church of Rome, I shall now consider the practice of it, which is more plain and evident, and notorious to all the world; however they would palliate and disguise their doctrine. According to their Missal, which is wholly different in this, as well as other things, from the old liturgy, and eucharistic forms, as I shall show by and by,—the priest in every mass, as soon as he has consecrated the bread and wine, with bended knees, he adores the sacrament; that which he has consecrated, that very thing which is before him, upon the patine, and in the chalice; and gives the same worship and subjection, both of body and mind to it, as he could to God or Christ himself: for, with his head and his soul, bowing towards it, and his eyes and thoughts fixed upon it, and directed to it, he prays to it, as to Christ himself; 'Lamb of God that takest away the sins of the world, have mercy upon us, grant us peace,' and the like; then the priest rising up after he has thus adored it himself, he lifts it up as high as conveniently he can, above his head, and with eyes fixed upon it, he shows it to be devoutly adored by the people, who having notice also by ringing the mass bell, as soon as they see it, fall down in the humblest adorations to it, as if it were the very appearance of God himself."

The remainder of the passage will be given in my next.

THE

Protestant,

No. LXI.

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 11th, 1819.

THE reader is requested to connect what is contained in this and the following page, with the conclusion of the last Number:—

“ If Christ were visibly present before them, they could not show more acts of reverence, and devotion, and worship, to him, than they do to the host. They pray to it, and use the very forms of petition and invocation to that, as to Christ himself; such as these,—‘ O saving host, or blessed sacrament, which openest the door of heaven, give me strength and power against dangers, and against all my enemies. Make me always more to believe, to hope in thee, to love thee: grant that my soul may always live upon thee, and that thou mayest always taste sweet unto it.’

“ Thus both the priest and the people are several times to adore and worship both the host and the cup in the celebration of the eucharist; and they will not disown, nor cannot, their directing and terminating their devotions and prayers upon the sacrament, which is before them. Prayers they call them to the eucharist, and it is become a common form of doxology amongst them, instead of saying, ‘ Praise be given to God,’ to say, ‘ Praise be given to the most holy sacrament.’ Sanders, in his book of the Supper of the Lord, instead of ‘ Glory be to the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost,’ turns it thus, ‘ To the body and blood of our Saviour, under the species of bread and wine, be all honour and praise, and thanksgiving for evermore:’ as if it were another person of the blessed Godhead.

“ This adoration is not only in the time of communion, when it is properly the Lord’s Supper and sacrament; but at other

VOL. II. L

times, out of it, whenever it is set upon the altar with the candles burning, and the incense smoking before it; or hung up in its rich shrine and tabernacle, with a canopy of state over it. And not only in the church, which is sanctified, they say, by this sacrament, as by the presence of God himself, but when it is carried through the streets in a solemn and pompous procession; as it is before the Pope, when he goes abroad, just as the Persian fire was before the emperor, merely by way of state, or for a superstitious end, that he may the better be guarded and defended by the company of his God. In all these times it is to be worshipped and adored by all persons as it passeth by, as if it were the glory of God which passeth by. They are, like Moses, to make haste, and bow their heads to the earth and worship; but above all on that high day, which they have dedicated to this sacrament, as if it were some new deity, the *festum Dei*, as they call it, the feast of God, or the *festum corporis Christi*, the feast of the body of Christ; for to call the sacrament God, is a general expression among them, as when they have received the sacrament, to say, 'I have received my Maker to-day;' and the person, who, in great churches, is to carry the sacrament to the numerous communicants, is called, *Bajulus Dei*, 'the porter or carrier of God;' and they always account it, and so always reverence it, as Boileau falsely says the ancients did, as a present Numen and Deity. This feast was appointed by Pope Urban IV. about the middle of the 12th century; and again by Clement V. in the beginning of the 13th, as is owned by themselves, upon the occasion of a vision to one Juliana, who saw a crack in the moon, that signified, it seems, a great defect in the church, for want of this solemnity. Such was the rise of this great festival, and so late was its institution in the Roman church; in which, and in no other Christian church in the world, is it observed to this day. And that the whole practice of the adoration of the host is novel, and unknown to the primitive church and to ancient writers, I shall endeavour to make evident against the bold and impudent canon of the Council of Trent, which is the first council that commanded it, in these words:—'If any one shall say that the sacrament is not to be worshipped by a peculiar festival, nor to be solemnly carried about in processions according to the laudable and universal manner and custom of the holy church; nor to be publicly proposed to the people, that it may be adored by them, and that the worshippers are idolaters: let him be accursed.'—The author gives in the margin the most ample authorities for his statements, from saints and fathers of the Romish church; and he generally gives their very words in the original Latin.

Thus I have shown that Papists address prayers and hymns to the sacrament, as if it were the living God. They profess to believe not only that God is in it, but that it is God. As such they pray to it, and trust in it. To honour it, they believe, is to honour God; and to condemn it, is to condemn Him. In their esteem there is no impiety equal to that of slighting the consecrated wafer; and no punishment too great for those who are guilty of it.

I shall illustrate this by a number of examples, all of a miraculous nature, and as well attested as things of the kind can be. We shall see, indeed, if we can believe the *facts* which I am going to relate, that the consecrated wafer has received the honour which was predicted of Christ in the viiith Psalm, and which is applied to him by the Apostle, in the i^{id} chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews: that under him should be put all beasts of the field, fowls of the air, fishes of the sea, and whatsoever passeth through the path of the sea. I have before me a vast collection of instances of the consecrated wafer being worshipped and adored by all sorts of creatures, from insects up to horses, asses, and oxen. This collection was originally made by Father Toussain Bridoul, a Jesuit; and from his work it is transferred by Mr. Gavin, into the third volume of his *Master Key to Popery*, from which the following are extracted. The Jesuit, in his preface, represents heretics, conducted, no doubt, by the devil, as conspiring to extirpate the holy sacrament, and so to destroy souls more easily; who cannot, he says, “subsist long in grace without the participation of this divine and celestial food.” “Wherefore,” he adds, “without troubling myself to confute these hair brained people, who turn a deaf ear to all that the holy Fathers have said about it; and having renounced their reason, I have resolved to send them to the school of the beasts, who have shown a particular inclination (not without a superior conduct) for the honour and defence of this truth.”

The chapter of the work from which I quote, is entitled, “A Collection of Miracles of the consecrated wafer, grounded upon the respects and acknowledgments which beasts, birds, and insects, on several occasions, have rendered to the holy wafer.” I am afraid my intelligent readers will reckon this a very trifling Number; but I request they will bear with it, as I feel it sometimes necessary to descend very low, in order to expose the idolatry and superstition of the Church of Rome:—

“*Petrus Cluniac, lib. 1. cap. 1.* reports, That a certain peasant of Auvergne, a province in France, perceiving that his bees were likely to die, to prevent this misfortune, was advised, after he had received the communion, to keep the host, and to blow it into one of his hives; and, on a sudden, all the bees

came forth out of their hives, and ranking themselves in good order, lifted the host up from the ground, and carrying it in upon their wings, placed it among the combs. After this the man went out about his business, and at his return, found that this advice had succeeded contrary to his expectation, for all his bees were dead. Nay, when he lifted up the hive, he saw that the host was turned into a fair child among the honey combs; and being much astonished at this change, and seeing that this infant seemed to be dead, he took it in his hands, intending to bury it privately in the church, but when he came to do it, he found nothing in his hands; for the infant was vanished away. This thing happened in the county of Clermont, which, for this irreverence, was, a while after, chastised by divers calamities, which so dispeopled those parts, that they became like a wilderness. From which it appears, that bees honour the holy host divers ways, by lifting it from the earth, and carrying it into their hives, as it were in procession." Let the reader remember, it was the God whom Papists worship, that was indebted to the bees for shelter in their hive.

" Cantiprat, *lib. 2. cap. 40. sect. 1.* writeth, That a certain poor man going to visit his bees, perceived them to make a sweet harmony: he stood ravished a while with it, not knowing what it meant. The night following, as he went about some business, and casting his eyes towards his bees, he perceived them to rejoice, and sport themselves, making an admirable melody. First, he informed his curate of it, and afterwards broke up his hive, where he found a box made of wax, but of such admirable whiteness, that it looked like ivory; and within it the holy sacrament adored by the bees, who ranged themselves into two choirs, and sang the praises of their Creator. The Bishop ordered a procession to carry back the holy host of the church; and in that place was erected a sumptuous chapel, which became a place of refuge for the sick and the afflicted. When nobody knew from whence, and by whom, that host had been brought there, two thieves of their own accord discovered themselves, and confessed, that having stolen a box, they had thrown the host against the hives. By which miracle we see that the bees adore the holy host, and sing the divine praises, dividing themselves into two choirs."

" Cæsarius, *lib. 9. cap. 8.* reports, That a certain woman, having received the communion unworthily, carried the host to her hives, for to enrich the stock of bees: and afterwards coming again to see the success, she perceived that the bees, acknowledging their God in the sacrament, had, with admirable artifice, erected to him a chapel of wax, with its doors, windows, bells, and vestry; and within it a chalice where they laid

the holy body of Jesus Christ. She could no longer conceal this wonder. The priest being advertised of it, came thither in procession, and he himself heard harmonious music, which the bees made, flying round about the sacrament; and having taken it out, he brought it back to the church full of comfort, certifying, that he had seen and heard our Lord acknowledged and praised by those little creatures."

The same author relates, *lib. 4. cap. 99.* "That an old and simple priest, of the parish of St. Colen, carrying the holy sacrament out of town to a sick person, and going up a very rough hill, met some loaded asses descending towards the town; and the way being very narrow, and the priest not being able to get past them, and fearing to be overturned by those beasts, he spoke to them according to his simplicity in this manner: My asses! what do you mean? Do ye not see him whom I carry? Go aside, and stop to make room for your Creator, which I command you in his name. O admirable obedience! Those asses, which used not to stir but when they were beaten, presently went to one side, where the hill was more steep, without apprehending any danger or letting fall their load. The town of Colen remembers this wonder to this day, and mentioneth it with astonishment."

"P. Orlandi, in his History of the Society, *tom. 1. lib. 2. No. 27.* says, That, in the 16th century, within the Venetian territories, a priest carrying the holy host, without pomp or train, to a sick person, he met, out of the town, asses going to their pasture; who, perceiving by a certain sentiment, what it was which the priest carried, they divided themselves into two companies on each side of the way, and fell on their knees. Whereupon the priest, with his clerk, all amazed, passed between those peaceable beasts, which then rose up, as if they would make a pompous show in honour of their Creator; followed the priest as far as the sick man's house, where they waited at the door till the priest came out from it, and did not leave him till he had given them his blessing. Father Simon Rodriguez, one of the first companions of St. Ignatius, who then travelled in Italy, informed himself carefully of this matter, which happened a little while before our first Fathers came into Italy, and found that all had happened as has been told."

"Nicholas de Laghi, in his book of the miracles of the holy sacrament, says, that a Jew blaspheming the holy sacrament, dared to say, that if the Christians would give it to his dog, he would eat it up, without showing any regard to their God. The Christians being very angry at this outrageous speech, and trusting in the Divine Providence, had a mind to bring it to a trial: so, spreading a napkin on the table, they laid on

it many hosts, among which one only was consecrated. The hungry dog being put upon the same table, began to eat them all, but coming to that which had been consecrated, without touching it, he kneeled down before it, and afterwards fell with rage upon his master, catching him so closely by the nose, that he took it quite away with his teeth."—"The same which St. Matthew warns such like blasphemers, saying, 'Give not that which is holy unto dogs, lest they turn again and rend you.'"

"St. Anthony of Padua, disputing one day with one of the most obstinate heretics that denied the truth of the holy sacrament, drove him to such a plunge, that he desired the saint to prove this truth by some miracle. St. Anthony accepted the condition, and said he would work it upon his mule. Upon this the heretic kept her three days without eating and drinking; and the third day, the saint, having said mass, took up the host, and made him bring forth the hungry mule, to whom he spoke thus:—In the name of the Lord, I command thee to come and do reverence to thy Creator, and confound the malice of heretics. While the saint made this discourse to the mule, the heretic sifted out oats to make the mule eat; but the beast having more understanding than his master, kneeled before the host, adoring it as its Creator and Lord. This miracle comforted all the faithful, and enraged the heretics; except him that disputed with the saint, who was converted to the Catholic faith."

In the catalogue before me, there are seventy-three such stories, all certified by some great saint or father; but I presume I have given enough of such matter to put it beyond a doubt that the prevailing belief of Papists is, that the wafer which they receive in the sacrament, is the God that made heaven and earth, and that the prevailing practice among them, is to adore it as such. The works of many Popish saints consist in little else than such stories as the above; and if they do not prove the Church of Rome to be guilty of suffering idolatry, and even encouraging the practice of it, it is not possible to prove any thing.

Before entering upon the discussion of what is called the Sacrifice of the Mass, I shall advert shortly to another peculiarity of the Church of Rome, in relation to the Lord's Supper; that is, communion in one kind, or withholding the cup from the laity. This rose out of transubstantiation, and is intimately connected with it; for the practice cannot be defended but upon the principle of transubstantiation.

In the words of institution, both as spoken by our Lord, and recited by the Apostle Paul, it seems perfectly evident, that both

bread and wine were to be given and received in the Lord's Supper. These were appointed to represent his body broken and his blood shed for the sins of his people. "With respect to the bread, Christ had said, Luke xxii. 19, 20. 'Take, eat, this is my body;' but concerning the cup, he says, 'Drink ye all of this;' for as this pointed out the very essence of the institution; to wit, the *blood of atonement*, it was necessary that each should have a particular application of it: therefore, he says, 'Drink YE ALL OF THIS.' By this we are taught, that the cup is essential to the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, so that they who deny the cup to the people, sin against God's institution; and they who receive not the cup, are not partakers of the body and blood of Christ. If either could without mortal prejudice be omitted, it might be the bread; but the cup, as pointing out the blood poured out, that is the life, by which alone the great sacrificial act is performed, and remission of sins procured, is absolutely indispensable. On this ground it is demonstrable, that there is not a Popish priest under heaven, who denies the cup to the people (and they all do this), that can be said to celebrate the Lord's Supper at all; nor is there one of their votaries that ever received the holy sacrament. All pretension to this is an absolute farce, so long as the cup, the emblem of the atoning blood, is denied. How strange is it, that the very men, who plead so much for the bare literal meaning of *this is my body*, in the preceding verse, should deny all meaning to *drink ye all of this cup*, in this verse! And though Christ has in the most positive manner enjoined it, they will not permit one of the laity to taste it! O what a thing is man! a constant contradiction to reason and himself. The conclusion therefore is unavoidable. The sacrament of the Lord's Supper is NOT celebrated in the Church of Rome." *Clarke on the Eucharist*, p. 60, 61.

If the concluding remark of this learned writer be correct, and I think it cannot be denied by any Protestant, it would appear that the priests would do the people no harm, though they withheld the bread as well as the cup from them. Christ instituted the ordinance of the Supper for the purpose of keeping alive in the minds of his people the remembrance of his death, until he should come again; but the observance of the ordinance can be of no use to persons who do not understand its meaning, which it is evident Papists do not; for instead of remembering Christ as *absent*, with respect to his body, as his words, "until I come," undoubtedly signify, they consider his body *present* in every consecrated wafer. The idea, therefore, of remembering him has no place in their minds, for the word remember does not apply to a thing that is present. It follows as a necessary consequence, that no believer in transubstantiation, that is, no true Papist, can obey our Lord's dying command,

‘Do this in remembrance of me;’ and it were better to let the sacrament alone altogether, than to do something else under the pretext of observing it.

I know that the priests withhold the cup from the laity, because, they say, in giving them the consecrated wafer, they give the true body of Christ, which being a living body, contains the blood; but if this were the case, the priests, as well as the people, would receive the whole Christ in receiving the bread, and there would be no occasion for wine at all; yet it is well known that they use plenty of wine, which, being consecrated, they say is the real blood of Christ, and the priests take it all to themselves; which is making a distinction between the clergy and the laity, that is quite unwarranted by the word of God, and the practice of the primitive churches. In short, as transubstantiation itself was not, strictly speaking, an article of faith in the Roman church, till it was made so in 1215, by the Lateran Council; so communion in one kind was not a general or authorised practice in that church, till it was ordained by the Council of Constance, about two hundred years after.

To deny the cup to the laity; to give them nothing but a piece of bread in the form of a wafer, and to call it the Lord’s supper; is most certainly a piece of barefaced imposition: But though they gave the wine along with the wafer, it would not mend the matter, or profit the souls of them who receive it, while they teach them to attach a false and idolatrous meaning to the service; and to consider it, not as a commemoration of the sacrifice of Christ, as an atonement for the sins of his people, but as in itself a real propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of the living and the dead. This is their doctrine concerning the sacrifice of the mass, which I intend to take up in my next Number; and while they attach such an absurdity to the ordinance of the Lord’s supper, they make it not the Lord’s supper: it is an impious invention of their own; and in a Christian point of view, it is a matter of no importance, whether idolaters use bread and wine, or bread and cheese, or bread alone, in the service of their idol.

I have travelled through many a dense folio page, full of learning and of argument, on the subject of withholding the cup from the laity; and have admired the patience of really eminent divines, who could enter so fully and minutely into the discussion of a question which appears to me so unimportant. For those who know what the ordinance of the Lord’s supper means, and believe the truth to which it relates, will never think of observing it without both bread and wine; and those who do not know what it means, and do not believe the truth, will not observe it, whether they use one or both of the elements.

THE

Protestant,

No. LXII.

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 18th, 1819.

“THE sacrifice of the mass,” says a late learned author, “is the most considerable part of worship in the Roman church. It is their *juge sacrificium*, their daily and continual offering, and the principal thing in which their religion does consist. It is, they tell us, of the greatest profit and advantage to all persons, and I am sure their priests make it so to themselves; for by this alone, a great number of them get their livings, by making merchandise of the holy sacrament, and by selling the blood of Christ at a dearer rate than Judas did. The saying of masses keeps the Church of Rome more priests in pay, than any prince in Christendom can maintain soldiers; and it has raised more money by them, than the richest bank or exchequer in the world was ever owner of. It is indeed the truest patrimony of their church, and has enriched it more than any thing else. It was that which founded their greatest monasteries, and their richest abbeys; and it had well nigh brought all the estates in this kingdom into the church, had not the statute of mortmain put a check to it. The donation of Constantine, were it ever so true, and the grants of Charles and Pepin, were they ever so large, and the gifts of all their benefactors put together, are infinitely out-done by it. The gain of it has been so manifestly great, that one cannot, but on that account, a little suspect its godliness.”—*Discourse of the Sacrifice of the Mass, by Mr. Payne, late Prebendary of Westminster, page 1.*

Before entering on a discussion of this subject, it will be right to tell what it is. I shall, therefore, give the doctrine as it is

laid down by the Douay Catechism, which *AMICUS VERITATIS* says is approved by the whole church:—

“ Q. Is the Eucharist a sacrament only? A. No, it is also a sacrifice. Q. What is a sacrifice? A. It is a supreme act of religion, due to Almighty God. Q. How is this performed? A. By offerings made to him, in testimony of his being the sovereign Lord of all things. Q. In what did the sacrifices of the old law consist? A. Chiefly in bloody sacrifices of beasts, which the priests offered in the temple, as figures of Christ's sacrifice on the cross, which was then to come. Q. In what consists the sacrifice of the new law? A. In the voluntary and bloody oblation which Christ made to his eternal Father, by dying on the cross for our redemption. Q. But this is past, how have we now any sacrifice in the new law? A. By the standing memorial and continuance of it in the blessed Eucharist. Q. Why do you say that the Eucharist is a standing memorial of Christ's sacrifice on the cross? A. Because Christ, at his last supper, commanded it should be offered as a remembrance of his passion to the end of the world; and this is what is performed in the sacrifice of the mass. Q. Why is it a continuance of Christ's sacrifice? A. Because Jesus Christ, who is a priest for ever, according to the order of Melchisedec, having offered himself once in a bloody manner on the altar of the cross, continues daily to offer himself, by the ministry of his priests, in an unbloody manner, under the form of bread and wine. So that the sacrifice offered on the cross, and the sacrifice of the mass, are one and the same, as to the chief priest who offers it, and the thing which is offered; and differ only in the manner of offering. Q. What therefore is the mass? A. It is the sacrifice of the body and blood of Jesus Christ, under the form of bread and wine, in memory of his death and passion for the remission of our sins. Q. Who said the first mass? A. Jesus Christ. Q. When did he say it? A. At his last supper, when he instituted the holy Eucharist. Q. To whom is the sacrifice of the mass offered? A. To God only. Q. Is it not sometimes offered to the saints? A. No, masses are sometimes said in honour and memory of the saints, in thanksgiving to God for the benefits he has been pleased to bestow upon them; and that they, joining their prayers to ours, may intercede for us in heaven, whose memory we celebrate here on earth. Q. What benefit receive we by this sacrifice? A. It is a daily application of the merits of Christ, for the relief of our necessities, by laying before the eternal Father, the infinite value of his Son's bitter passion. Q. What are the benefits the living receive by it? A. They are many; 1. It applies the merits of our Saviour's passion for the remission of our sins. 2. It procures new graces and blessings

for us, by virtue of the said passion. 3. It is the most acceptable offering we can make to Almighty God, in thanksgiving for all his benefits. Q. Does it avail the faithful departed? A. It is not to be doubted, but as St. Augustine, *Serm. 26. de verbis Apostoli*, cap. 2. says, by this wholesome sacrifice, which is offered for them, they are so far helped, as to be treated with more mercy than their sins deserve. Q. Is it not a prejudice to the faithful, that the mass is said in an unknown language? A. No; for the mass contains only those prayers which the priest alone is commanded to say, as the mediator between God and his people. Neither are the people ignorant of what is said, since they have the mass expounded and Englished in their ordinary prayer books."

From this long extract, the reader will see what is the most modified and moderate view which Papists give of this great act of their worship. The Douay Catechism, being calculated for the meridian of Scotland, is much less gross, both in sentiment and expression, than most others that are issued by the Church of Rome. It does not, for instance, say in plain words, that the mass is a real propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead, though as much is implied in the words which represent it as the very same sacrifice that Christ offered on the cross, and in the words which it ascribes to St. Augustine, that the dead are so far helped by it, "as to be treated with *more* mercy than their sins deserve;" from which last expression, I remark, in passing, that it seems to be a doctrine held by Papists that their sins deserve *some* mercy. The mass only helps them to *more* than they would otherwise deserve. All the world is acquainted with the Popish doctrine of the merit of good works; but I suppose this will be the first time the world has been informed that they ascribe some merit to their sins; and that these deserve mercy, though but in a small degree, without the additional merit of the mass.

The Catechism, for the use of all the churches in the French empire, more explicitly declares the mass to be a sacrifice of propitiation. Speaking of the souls of the dead, it is asked and answered, "Are these souls any wise relieved by this sacrifice? A. Yes: they are very much relieved. Q. Why? A. Because in it Jesus Christ is offered as the common propitiation for all mankind." The thing is asserted still more plainly in "The grounds of Catholic doctrine, contained in the profession of faith, published by Pope Pius IV." in which we read as follows:—"Q. What is the Catholic doctrine as to the mass? A. That in the mass, there is offered unto God, a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead. Q. What do you mean by the mass? A. The consecration and oblation

of the body and blood of Christ, under the sacramental veils or appearances of bread and wine : So that the mass was instituted by Christ himself at his last supper : Christ himself said the first mass ; and ordained that his Apostles and their successors should do the like. Do this in remembrance of me. Luke xxii. 19. Q. What do you mean by a *propitiatory* sacrifice ? A. A sacrifice for obtaining mercy, or by which *God is moved to mercy.*" There is an error in the last expression, which I have marked by Italics, distinct from the error of the mass sacrifice, though connected with it, and which I shall expose by and by ; but, at present, I wish to give a full view of the subject as it is set down by Popish authors.

The following is from a work entitled, " Holy Altar and Sacrifice explained," by the Rev. Father Pacificus Baker, of the order of St. Francis :—" Many are the spiritual graces and benefits which the devout Christian gains by seriously attending to, and assisting at, this holy sacrifice. *First*, By the sacrifice of the mass, the fruits of Christ's bloody sacrifice of himself on the altar of his cross, are applied to our souls. This sacrifice of the mass being the same with that on the cross, differing only in the manner. On the cross Christ offered himself in a bloody manner, shedding every drop of his sacred blood, as a sacrifice of redemption for mankind. In the mass he offers himself by the ministry of the priest, in an unbloody manner. Hence the mass is called by the holy Fathers, an *incruental*, or unbloody sacrifice ; for, as the Council of Trent declares, *Sess. xxii. 6. 2.* It is one and the same host (or body), and the same offerer, now by the ministry of the priest, who offered himself on the cross, differing only in the manner of offering, the fruits of which unbloody oblation are here most plentifully received. *Secondly*, The Mass is *latreutical*, that is, a holocaust, or oblation, offered to God in acknowledgment of his supreme majesty and dominion over us ; worshipping him herein with divine worship, due to him alone and not to any creature, how excellent and perfect soever. *Thirdly*, It is a *eucharistic* sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving for, as well as commemoration of, the inestimable benefit of Christ's passion, and of praise and thanksgiving for all the blessings we have received, spiritual and temporal. *Fourthly*, It is an *impetratory* sacrifice, by which we may obtain whatever we ask, if we ask as we ought, according to what our Saviour says ; " Ask and you shall receive," John xvi. For the Father will not deny what we ask in his Son's name, much less when we ask by his Son, who is here offered to him. With him he has given us all things. With him he will refuse us nothing. *Fifthly*, It is a *propitiatory* sacrifice, by which we may obtain pardon of our sins, our daily failings and offences

against God, by the merits of Christ's passion, here renewed and offered up for us."

I believe no real sacrifice ever made on earth contained so many things as are here ascribed to the mass, not even the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross. This certainly was not unbloody, or *incrumental*, as the reverend father says that of the mass is: and I would question very much the propriety of calling the sacrifice of Christ eucharistical. If the mass, then, have two ingredients which the sacrifice of Christ had not, it is absurd to call it the very same sacrifice. The sacrifice of Christ was undoubtedly propitiatory; and the principal error of the Church of Rome, on this subject, consists in ascribing the same character to their mass.

When Papists are pushed upon such a subject as this, they will not admit the authority of individual authors, however great, or even of such Catechisms as are recommended by their priests, and in general and daily use. The Douay Catechism, as I have said, does not use the word propitiatory; and, therefore, a Scottish Papist, when assailed by a Protestant, may disavow the doctrine as not in his Catechism. On the other hand, should he be accused by one of his own brethren, of not holding that fundamental doctrine of his church, that the mass is a real propitiatory sacrifice, he will get out by referring to his Catechism, in which the mass is declared to be the very same sacrifice which Christ offered on the cross, which is allowed on all hands to be propitiatory.

But that none of my Popish readers may have it in their power to evade the question, or deny that their church holds this doctrine, on account of any defect in my authorities, I shall now cite the highest authority known in their church, that is, the Council of Trent, which may justly be said to be higher with them than the Bible itself; for that Council not only decreed many things contrary to the Bible, but actually added to it a number of books, whose authors never dreamed that they wrote under divine inspiration, or that their works should be exalted to an equality with the word of God.

The holy Council has decreed thus:—"If any shall say, that in the mass a true and proper sacrifice is not offered to God, let him be accursed. If any shall say in those words (*Do this in remembrance of me*), Christ did not institute his Apostles to be priests, or that he did not ordain that they and other priests should offer his body and blood, let him be accursed." "If any shall say, the sacrifice of the mass is only of praise and thanksgiving, or a bare commemoration of the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross, and not a propitiatory sacrifice; or that it profits him alone that takes it, and ought not to be offered for quick and dead, for sins, punishments, and satisfactions, and

other necessities, let him be accursed." *Concil. Trid. Sess. 22 de Sacrific. Missæ. can. 1, 2, 3.*

This is the doctrine of the Church of Rome distinctly laid down. Every Popish priest takes a solemn oath to abide by it, and all that the Council of Trent has decreed; and we see by the above, that a solemn curse is pronounced against all who say that the mass is not a propitiatory sacrifice; and that it ought not to be offered for the quick and dead, for sins, punishments, and satisfactions. I consider myself, therefore, as standing under the curse of the most *holy* and *infallible* church; but while advocating the truth of God, I can, without anxiety about the matter, use the words of the Psalmist:—"Let them curse, but bless thou."

One of the worst features of modern Popery, is the affected liberality of Papists. Their fawning and flattering of their Protestant brethren, as they now condescend to call us, are infinitely more disgusting than their cursing and wrath. The wolf is never so dangerous as when he appears in a sheep's coat. Modern Papists affect all the meekness of the lamb, because they want what they call emancipation, that is, nothing less than a place in the legislature and government of the kingdom. But they know that they look upon Protestants as heretics accursed. They will not tell us so just now, though all their priests have sworn to it, and all the faithful must believe as their priests bid them. They speak in very mild language, at present, because they want something which Protestants have in their power to deny them. They condescend even so far as to use the phrase, "our dissenting brethren," hoping that Dissenters will be flattered by their condescension, that they will be induced to forward their cause, and help them to places of power, and to that ascendancy which is their ultimate object. But their soft words and fair speeches can deceive only the hearts of the simple. Their affected moderation is gross hypocrisy, while they carry, under the cloak, all the cursing and bitterness of their fathers against those who will not fall down and worship their mass idol. If it be not so, let them renounce the Council of Trent, and withdraw their solemn curses against those who deny their mass sacrifice, and trust in the sacrifice of Christ alone. I have no doubt many of them will even do this to serve a purpose; but when the purpose is gained, they will find out that they were incompetent to make the renunciation. Though the Pope himself were to withdraw these curses, and though he were to grant leave to all the Papists in Britain and Ireland to disavow them, it would be found, when they had attained the object which they have in view, that the Pope was incompetent to set aside a solemn decree of a general council, confirmed by the Pope of the day. Those who shall live to witness Popish as-

cendency in this country, will have a better understanding of this than my present readers have. The curses which have been accumulating for ages upon the heads of all who deny that the mass is a propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of the living and the dead, will break forth with dreadful fury upon all who shall refuse to bow the knee to the idol which the Church of Rome has set up. In the days of the Council of Trent, curses were not empty sounds. The Church of Rome boasts of being unchanged and unchangeable; and this is almost the only true thing which she utters amidst her thousands of lies. She will therefore be what she was in the days of that Council, whenever she has the opportunity and the power.

But to return to the mass itself,—it is said to be a propitiatory sacrifice. Such the Council of Trent declares it to be; and the expression refers to that which reconciles sinners to their offended Creator. This is expressly asserted in the New Testament of the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross. “Him hath God set forth to be a propitiation, through faith in his blood.” Rom. iii. 25. And “God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself,” &c. 2 Cor. v. 19. I shall show, by and by, that this is true of the sacrifice of Christ, and that it cannot be true of any thing else; but, in the meantime, I shall expose the error to which I adverted in a preceding page of this Number. After having declared the mass to be a propitiatory sacrifice, it is asserted in “The grounds of Catholic doctrine,” that a propitiatory sacrifice is that “by which *God is moved to mercy* ;” and in the mass, such a sacrifice is offered. Now this is ascribing more to the mass than can be justly ascribed to the sacrifice of Christ himself, and to all that he did and suffered, while on earth.

The minds of Papists are so estranged from the knowledge of the true God, that when they do speak of him, they speak of him as if he were an idol. They look upon God the Father as if he were a cruel and austere Being, not of himself inclined to be merciful; and they consider that the intercession of Christ, and of the Virgin Mary, and other saints, and the sacrifice of the mass, are all necessary to *move him* to mercy. With such a false idea of God in their minds, they cannot worship him otherwise, or from any other motive, than that from which the American Indians worship the devil—that he may not hurt them.

It is not true, even of the sacrifice of Christ, that it moved God to mercy, or that it was necessary for that purpose. Christ did not come into the world, and lay down his life, to purchase or procure the mercy of God for sinners. Such an idea is quite inconsistent with his own explicit testimony, in which he declares his work of saving sinners, to be the work which his Father had given him to do. So far from requiring to be moved

to mercy, by the intervention of any agent, divine or human, God is in himself infinitely merciful; and it was in the mercy of God the Father that the salvation of sinners originated. Christ does not tell his disciples, that he came into the world in order to move his Father to be merciful to them. He ascribes the sending of himself, and all the blessings which he brought with him, to the mercy of his Father. "God so loved the world, that he *gave* his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life." John iii. 16. "When the fulness of the time was come, God *sent forth* his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, that he might redeem them that were under the law." Gal. iv. 4, 5. "Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and *sent* his Son to be the propitiation for our sins." 1 John iv. 10. And those who are saved by faith in Christ, are taught to trace up their salvation to the mercy of God the Father. "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who according to his *abundant mercy*, hath begotten us again to a lively hope, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead." 1 Pet. i. 3. From such passages as these, and there are many such in the Bible, it is evident that God is not moved to mercy by the consideration of any thing done, or to be done, in heaven or in earth. The Popish doctrine, therefore, is most erroneous. It presents a false view of the divine character; and from such a view of it, nothing but false or idolatrous worship can proceed.

Christ came into the world to do his Father's will. This was to make reconciliation for iniquity, and bring in everlasting righteousness;—to accomplish the salvation of sinners, by giving his life a ransom for them. This was not to procure the mercy of God; but to satisfy his justice, without which, mercy could have no place; for mercy, at the expense of justice, would be inconsistent with all that the Bible makes known to us of the divine character. The justice of God is as essential, and as amiable an attribute as his mercy; and the law of God is as holy, and as amiable as his gospel. Christ magnified the one which we had broken, and satisfied the other which we had offended. He "put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." By giving himself up to the death, he made a full and sufficient atonement for sin; so that our salvation is ascribed to him alone, who hath redeemed us to God by his own blood. The pretended sacrifice of the mass is an impious attempt to rob him of the glory that is his due. It diverts the minds of men from the work of Christ, to the work of a fellow creature of a priest, who pretends to offer up daily a propitiatory sacrifice, while he has no more power to do so, than he has to create a world.

THE

Protestant,

No. LXIII.

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 25th, 1819.

MY last Number contains the doctrine of the Church of Rome, on the subject of the Mass, as laid down by the Douay and other Catechisms, and by the supreme authority of the Council of Trent. The Mass is declared to be a real propitiatory sacrifice, for the living and the dead; and if any man shall say otherwise, "let him be accursed." It is the object of the present Number to show that this is a great and fundamental error; that it sets aside the sacrifice of Christ; and that it implies no less than a rejection of Christ himself, as the Saviour of the world; for as there is no other name, so there is no other sacrifice than that of Christ, in virtue of which, a sinner can be saved. If a man trust in the mass-sacrifice for propitiation, he is trusting in something else than the righteousness of Christ; and this is the same thing as to trust in another Saviour.

A propitiatory sacrifice is that on account of which God's anger is turned away from sinners,—that for the sake of which he pardons their sins, receives them into a state of friendly intercourse, and gives them everlasting life. As sinners, we can have no friendly intercourse with our Creator, any more than a band of rebels could have with their sovereign. If it were so that convicted traitors enjoyed the countenance and favour of the King, it would appear to every good subject, that he had compromised the honour of his crown and government; and that, in fact, he encouraged rebellion against his own authority.

Sin places mankind in the state here supposed, in relation to the Creator and Sovereign of heaven and earth. As trans-

gressors of his law, we are rebels against his authority; and to suppose friendly intercourse to exist—to suppose rebels to enjoy his favour, and to have access to him as friends, would appear to all other intelligent creatures, as indeed it would appear to the rebels themselves, a departure from the strictness of his law, a relaxation of the rules of his government; and an encouragement to continue in disobedience. There is no way, therefore, by which it is possible that sinners, such as we all are, by nature and by practice, can be brought to the enjoyment of the divine favour, or into a state of friendship with God, but in the way of a propitiatory sacrifice, offered by one adequate to the undertaking, and accepted by Him whom we had offended by our transgressions.

Such a sacrifice Christ offered upon the cross. “He loved us,” says an Apostle, “and gave himself for us, an offering and a sacrifice to God of a sweet smelling savour.” This sacrifice was fully adequate. As such it was accepted. It derived infinite value from the dignity of Him who offered it; and the fact of such a sacrifice being necessary, in order to the restoration of sinners to favour and friendship with God, shows, in the most striking manner, the evil of sin, the divine abhorrence of it, and that disorder and disobedience cannot be suffered with impunity, under the divine administration.

The sacrifice of Christ consisted in giving himself up to death, and that by the shedding of his blood upon the cross. This was not the mere surrender of natural life. His death contained all that was implied in the sentence of death denounced against the first transgression:—“In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.” This death consisted in the loss of the image and favour of God, and the effects of his displeasure, which, to immortal creatures, must necessarily be eternal, unless reparation be made equal to the eternal punishment of creatures. This was done in the sufferings of Christ, when he made his soul an offering for sin;—when he bare the sins of his people in his own body on the tree;—when God laid upon him the iniquities of them all; when he poured out his soul unto death, bearing the sins of many, and making intercession for the transgressors. Then God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not imputing their trespasses to them: that is, when Christ offered himself in sacrifice to God upon the cross, God was in him, by that sacrifice, making reconciliation, or taking away the grounds of difference, which stood between him and sinners of the human race. In the work of obedience and suffering, of which his death was the consummation, Christ satisfied the justice of God, magnified his law; and showed both his law and justice in characters more glorious, than could have

been exhibited by the obedience and the suffering of all creatures put together.

In the sacrifice of Christ, therefore, a ground is laid for the salvation of sinners, consistently with the character of justice, which is as essential in Deity as that of mercy. Nay, if we can use, with propriety, the language of comparison on such a subject, we may say it is more so; for we can conceive of Deity without mercy, at least without the exercise of mercy; for there was no occasion for this until sin and misery entered into the universe; but it is impossible to have rational conceptions of Deity, without the attribute of justice. A ground being thus laid for the salvation of sinners, by the sacrifice of Christ, it is effectual to the salvation of every one who believes the divine testimony concerning it; for he that believes this, acknowledges himself to be a sinner, and to deserve eternal punishment; he is brought to cordial repentance for his sins; he comes to Christ as a needy suppliant; he trusts in Him alone for pardon and deliverance from sin, as well as from its punishment; and Christ has said, "Him that cometh unto me, I will in no wise cast out."

The offering which Christ made of himself to God as a propitiatory or atoning sacrifice, was so excellent, as to supersede all other sacrifice. From the time that mercy was revealed to our first parents, and a Saviour promised to come of the seed of the woman, until this Saviour did come, God was worshipped by sacrifices. Animals were slain by divine appointment; and the believing worshipper, confessing his sins over the head of the bleeding victim, was taught to look for pardon, not for the sake of the blood that was shed by his hands, but through the blood of the Saviour, who was typified and represented by the lamb, or other animal, offered in sacrifice. The sacrifice of Christ availed for the salvation of those who believed the promise of his coming, and professed this belief by the offering of beasts, as really as it avails for the salvation of those who believe that he has come according to the promise, and that he has put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. "Him hath God set forth to be a propitiation, through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness, for the remission of sins that are past, through the forbearance of God; to declare at this time his righteousness; that he might be just, and the justifier of him that believeth in Jesus." Rom. iii. 25, 26. Thus we find that sins which were past, or committed before the coming of Christ, were remitted on account of the propitiation, or sacrifice which Christ made of himself; and that God is just in granting the pardon of sin to them who believe in Christ.

Now, this sacrifice of propitiation being made, there is no need of any other; and we are explicitly taught, in the New

Testament, that all others are superseded by it. The sacrifices which were offered according to the law of Moses, as well as those of the patriarchal state, were mere shadows, or typical representations, of the sacrifice of Christ, and could be of no use after the substance, or thing signified, was come. They never were of any use in themselves, but merely as pointing or directing the mind of the worshipper to Christ and his sacrifice; and now they are of no use at all; nay, so far from being useful, the repeating of them would be nothing less than rebellion against God, and a rejecting of the sacrifice which he has provided.

I believe there is nothing laid down in the word of God more plainly than this. It was the principal design of the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews to prove to Christians, who were Jews by birth, that the ceremonial part of the law of Moses was abrogated; and he is particularly explicit upon the subject of sacrifice. It is scarcely possible to use words to express more strongly the fact of every divinely appointed sacrifice having terminated in that of Christ, than the Apostle uses in the xth chapter of this epistle. He says "that the law could not, with those sacrifices which were offered year by year continually, make the comers thereunto perfect"—"that it was not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats could take away sin." "If such sacrifices could have effected this, they would not have ceased to be offered;" in which words it is implied that they have ceased to be offered. And we shall see, by and by, that this applies not only to the bloody sacrifices under the law, but to every thing that can be named, or thought of, that is of the nature of a propitiatory sacrifice. Such sacrifices have ceased to be offered; and therefore there is no such thing as that which Papists call the sacrifice of the mass.

The Apostle declares that the sacrifices which the priests offered daily, could never take away sins; "but this man," speaking of Christ, "after he had offered *one sacrifice* for sins, for ever sat down at the right hand of God; from henceforth expecting till his enemies be made his footstool; for by *one offering* he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified," verses 12—14. Here every thing that a propitiatory sacrifice could accomplish, is declared to be accomplished by the one offering or sacrifice of Christ. They who are sanctified by the will of God, through the offering of the body of Christ *once*, are declared to be perfected for ever; that is, they have a perfect standing before God, as justified persons, on the footing of what Christ has done for them; for the Apostle cites the words of God by Jeremiah,— "Their sins and iniquities I will remember no more;" and then he draws this unavoidable inference, "Where remission of these is, *there is no more offering for sin*," verses 17, 18. Again

the Apostle declares, in the same chapter, "If we sin wilfully after we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth *no more sacrifice for sins*; but a certain fearful looking for of judgment and fiery indignation, which shall devour the adversaries." That is, if persons will continue to live in sin, after they are told of an atoning sacrifice, and of the mercy of God ready to pardon, and to give a new heart to serve him, they must abide the consequence. They must suffer not only the punishment of their former sins, but also the fearful punishment of that greatest of all sins—despising and rejecting the blood of Christ, which made atonement for sin: For those who reject this sacrifice shall never have another. But the Church of Rome professes to have a sacrifice to offer for sins every day;—a sacrifice, which, they say, profits both the living and the dead, which helps them to mercy, and moves God to mercy, and relieves them, less or more, from the punishment which their sins deserve. There are no words in human language that can express the diabolical wickedness of such a doctrine. It is directly opposed to the plain declaration of God himself, in the words which I have just cited; and it goes to set aside all the faithful threatenings and warnings which are contained in the Bible. Men may live in sin, and die in sin, and yet have the benefit of a propitiatory sacrifice to relieve them from the punishment which they deserve! The church that teaches this is guilty of the murder of all the souls that perish in the delusion.

The great and fundamental error of the Church of Rome, on the subject of the mass-sacrifice, appears in this, that it necessarily implies a rejection of the one sacrifice of Christ upon the cross. The sacrifice of Christ was a sufficient atonement for sin, or it was not. Those who say that it was not, plainly reject the gospel testimony, and are not to be reasoned with as Christians; but ought at once to be classed with avowed infidels. Those who say that the sacrifice of Christ was a sufficient atonement for sin, and yet plead the necessity of another sacrifice—of a sacrifice daily repeated, in order to move God to mercy, contradict themselves, and without the honesty of the avowed infidel, they put themselves upon the same footing, and equally with him reject the sacrifice of Christ.

To say that a propitiatory sacrifice is still necessary, and that the church offers one every day, is, in plain language, to say that Christ has not done what he professes to have done, and what all his inspired messengers declare that he has done; namely, that he bare the sins of his people in his own body on the tree—that he gave his life for them—and that he is the Lamb of God, who hath taken away the sins of the world. If any other sacrifice be necessary, this is not true; and as the Church

of Rome puts forth her sacrifice of the mass as a necessary part of her daily worship, she is guilty of denying Christ and his sacrifice. She says, in effect, Christ has not taken away sin by the sacrifice of himself, for sin still requires to be taken away, and the priest must do it by the sacrifice of the mass. If this be not to set aside the sacrifice of Christ altogether, words have no meaning.

The Apostle argues, Heb. x. that by the repetition of sacrifices there was a remembrance of sin made every year. The very circumstance of repetition proved the fact, that such sacrifices could not take away sin. The one sacrifice of Christ is of such efficacy, that, in virtue of it, sin is remembered no more. The transgressions of those who have interest in this sacrifice, are blotted out as a cloud, and their sins as a thick cloud. But the Church of Rome professes to have a sacrifice daily repeated. This, according to the Apostle's reasoning, must be a sacrifice that cannot take away sin; but which serves only to bring sin daily to remembrance. Instead of being a sacrifice on account of which God will remember sin no more, and on the ground of which the sinner enjoys peace and pardon, it serves no purpose but to bring sin perpetually to view, and to keep the sinner in continual bondage and uncertainty. It will not mend the matter to say, that the mass is the very same sacrifice which Christ offered upon the cross; for, according to the reasoning of the Apostle, if it be a sacrifice that requires to be repeated, it cannot take away sin.

The Church of Rome calls the mass an *unbloody*, as well as a propitiatory sacrifice. Now, these two characters cannot possibly belong to any one sacrifice. There are eucharistical sacrifices which are not bloody; such, for instance, as the Apostle speaks of, Heb. xiii. 15. "Let us offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is, the fruit of our lips, giving thanks to his name." In such passages the word sacrifice is used in a figurative, and not strictly proper sense; but where a sacrifice is said to be propitiatory, it necessarily implies the shedding of blood, that is, the death of the victim; for the Apostle tells us plainly, Heb. ix. 22, "Without shedding of blood there is no remission." Remission, or pardon of sin, is the fruit of a propitiatory sacrifice; but if there be no remission, there has been no propitiation, for the latter being made, the former is granted as the just reward of it; and there is neither the one nor the other without shedding of blood. Those, therefore, who call the mass an unbloody sacrifice, (and this is the language of most Popish catechisms and books of devotion) virtually give up the doctrine of its being propitiatory, and thus contradict both themselves and the Council of Trent.

By the use of the term *unbloody*, as applied to the sacrifice of the mass, Papists endeavour to evade the charge of cruelty and barbarity, which Protestants bring against them, upon the supposition, that the real body and blood of Christ are offered to God in this sacrifice. It is admitted that Christ, in offering himself to God in sacrifice, suffered inexpressible agony. He suffered not only from the hands of men, but also from the powers of darkness; and, above all, from the wrath of his Father, on account of the sins of his people, which were laid to his account, and which he assumed as his own, in order that he might make atonement for them, by the shedding of his blood. In this sacrifice of himself he bare the sins of his people in his own body, and suffered the punishment that was due to them. Now, if the mass be the very same sacrifice—if in it Christ be offering himself every day, he must every day undergo the same suffering—he must be every day bearing the sins of his people, and every day enduring their punishment. I know the Church of Rome will not say this. They say, indeed, plainly enough, that the sacrifice of the mass is not a suffering or bloody one. Then I say that it cannot be a sacrifice or offering of Christ at all; for his offering of himself, and his suffering, are represented in Scripture as precisely the same thing.

See what the Apostle says, Heb. ix. 24—26. “For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are the figures of the true; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God for us: nor yet that he should *offer* himself *often*, as the high priest entereth into the holy place once every year, with blood of others; for then must he often have *suffered* since the foundation of the world; but now *once* in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin, by the sacrifice of himself.” From this the Apostle evidently means to assert, that had Christ been often *offered*, he must often have *suffered*. In his mind, the ideas of offering and suffering, in relation to Christ, were the same thing. Now, since the Church of Rome professes to make an offering and sacrifice of Christ every day, they must put him to death every day, else their notions of sacrifice and offering are quite different from what the word of God teaches.

Besides, the Apostle evidently lays great stress on the fact of Christ offering himself *once*, and only once, as his words imply; for he puts a strong negative upon his offering himself *often*, as a thing that was not to be supposed possible, or at all consistent with the perfection of his sacrifice.

If Christ is to be often offered to God as a propitiatory sacrifice, then it follows, that no one offering of his has yet made propitiation, or atonement for sin. The Bible tells us that he

hath made reconciliation by the blood of his cross—that in him we receive the atonement, or reconciliation; but, according to the Church of Rome, this is not true, for the propitiatory sacrifice requires still to be offered. In the Bible we learn that Christ made reconciliation for iniquity, and brought in everlasting righteousness; and that the Lord is well pleased for his righteousness' sake, because he hath magnified the law and made it honourable. This assures us, that in the sacrifice of Christ, the justice of God was satisfied, else he would not have been well pleased with it; and if divine justice was satisfied by the sufferings of Christ *once*, or, which is the same thing, by his *one* sacrifice, it would be unjust to require the repetition of it; but the Church of Rome is guilty of the impiety of charging the Almighty with injustice, by requiring the daily repetition of the sacrifice, by which, when it was offered on the cross, his justice was satisfied, and his law magnified.

The sacrifice of Christ has, farther, this glorious peculiarity, that all the benefits of it are bestowed for nothing; whereas, the Church of Rome makes her members pay immense sums for her mass-sacrifice. It is an old Popish proverb, “No pay no pater noster;” and it is equally true of the benefits of their propitiatory sacrifice—No pay no pardon. The priest professes to offer the body and blood of Christ in sacrifice every day; but no sinner shall receive the benefit of it without money. There is a sordidness and a carnality here, that is absolutely inconsistent with a spiritual and divine religion. Popery is not of God, but of Mammon; and though they have not the image of this idol among their other images, it is evident that he has a greater hold of their hearts than any one of them.

The blessings which flow from the sacrifice of Christ are figuratively compared to the riches of Canaan, as wine, and milk, and pure water; and the needy are invited freely to partake of them. Such is the language of divine liberality. “Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters, and he that hath no money: come ye, buy and eat, yea, come, buy wine and milk without money and without price.” Isa. lv. 1. Again, “The Spirit and the Bride say, come. And let him that heareth say, come. And let him that is athirst come. And whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely.” Rev. xxii. 17. This is in the true character of kindness and mercy, and is therefore worthy of God; but to set up spiritual blessings to sale, and to extort money for them, is worthy of the devil.

THE

Protestant,

No. LXIV.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 2d, 1819.

ABSURD and impious as the Popish doctrine of the mass sacrifice is, the Douay, and some other catechisms, allege scripture authority for it. I endeavoured in my last Number to show that the Bible knows nothing of any real propitiatory sacrifice but that of Christ: that by the one offering of himself, he accomplished all the purposes of such a sacrifice; that no other is needed, or ever will be offered; and that to trust in any other, or in the pretended repetition of this, implies no less than a rejection of Christ and his sacrifice of atonement. I proceed, in the present Number, to answer the arguments from scripture, which some Papists use in support of their doctrine; but it must be allowed, that the more wise and candid among them choose to rest it upon the foundation of tradition, and church authority, rather than upon the authority of the Bible.

Great stress is laid upon the fact of Christ being a priest according to the order of Melchisedec. In the Douay catechism, in answer to the question, "Why is it (the mass) a continuance of Christ's sacrifice?" it is answered, "Because Jesus Christ, who is a priest for ever according to the order of Melchisedec, having offered himself in a bloody manner on the altar of the cross, continues daily to offer himself, by the ministry of his priests, in an unbloody manner, under the form of bread and wine." And in the "Sincere Christian Instructed in the Faith of Christ, from the written word," a work ascribed to the late Bishop Hay of Edinburgh, we read as follows:—"The second proof from the New Testament is taken from the seventh

chapter of the Epistle to the Hebrews, where St. Paul, citing this prophecy of David, ‘The Lord hath sworn and will not repent. Thou art a priest for ever according to the order of Melchisedec,’ urges it to show the excellency of the priesthood of Christ above that of Aaron, and to prove that his priesthood shall never end: whereas, that of Aaron being only a figure of his, was of necessity abolished when he came. Now the same Apostle assures us, that every high priest ‘is appointed to offer up gifts and sacrifices for sins,’ Heb. v. 1. and he repeats it, Heb. viii. 3. and adds as a consequence of this essential office of a priest, ‘Wherefore it is of necessity that he should have something to offer.’ Seeing, therefore, that the order of Melchisedec consisted in offering bread and wine, and that the great victim offered by Christ, is his own precious body and blood, it is only by offering this under the appearances of bread and wine, by the external ministry of his priest, that he continues a priest for ever of this order.”

Here there are some things of which I must take a cursory notice, before I enter upon the exposure of the weakness of the argument drawn from the case of Melchisedec. I object to the expression, Christ offering “himself by the ministry of his *priests*.” I have no objection to the word priest, as used to denote the ministers of the gospel, if it be understood merely as a contraction of the word presbyter, which signifies elder; but when the term priest is used, and connected with the act of sacrifice, there is nothing in the New Testament that authorises the use of it, except that all Christians, whether Jew or Gentile, male or female, are declared to be made kings and *priests* unto God, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, holy, and acceptable, by Jesus Christ. The New Testament knows nothing of an order of men set apart for the purpose of offering sacrifices, as the sons of Aaron were.—Christ alone is the High Priest of our profession; and his servants in the gospel are ordained, not to offer a sacrifice for sin, but to preach and declare to the world, that the great sacrifice of atonement has been made by Christ himself; and to lead the worship of his churches, by dispensing the ordinances which he has appointed to be observed till his second coming. If the Romish clergy can find in the New Testament any authority for calling themselves priests, in the sense of being sacrificers, otherwise than all Christians are, let them produce it; and it will be well for them if they can make it appear that they are entitled to the appellation, even in the sense in which it is justly applied to the poorest and most illiterate Christian in the world.

I observe, farther, that there is a great fallacy in the argument of the Bishop, on the subject of priests and sacrifices. He says

indeed true, that the "Apostle assures us, that every high priest is appointed to offer gifts and sacrifices for sins." The Apostle is evidently speaking of the priesthood of Aaron, which he declares to have been abolished, or superseded by that of Christ; but our Scottish Bishop would have it understood, that this is a priesthood in the Christian church, continued to the present day, and to be continued to the end of the world; and he will have it, that it is only by the offering of the body and blood of Christ, "under the appearances of bread and wine, by the ministry of *his priest*, that he continues to be a priest for ever of this order;" which is a mere gratuitous assumption; and it proves nothing but that according to the doctrine of this prelate, it must depend upon the good pleasure of such men as himself, whether or not Christ shall continue a priest for ever; for if all the priests should take it into their heads to become Protestants, and cease to offer up Christ under the appearances of bread and wine, Christ would be a priest no longer; for it is *only* by this, (that is, being offered by the external ministry of his priests), that Christ continues a priest for ever, of the order of Melchisedec. Thus, not the Pope of Rome only, but every pedant of a priest, will be found guilty of exalting himself above all that is called God, and that is worshipped.

Who Melchisedec was, I do not pretend with certainty to say, but from his being both a king and a priest, and his name signifying king of righteousness and king of peace, he was an eminent type of Christ, who is a priest upon his throne. Some learned men have been of opinion, that this king of Salem, and priest of the Most High God, was no other than Shem, the eldest son of Noah. From Genesis xi. 11. we learn by the incidental mention of Shem's age, that he must have been alive at the time when Abraham was met by Melchisedec, on returning from the slaughter of the kings, Gen. xiv. and for more than half a century after. We can scarcely then suppose a man to have been in the world, more venerable, and of greater dignity than Shem, who had been an inhabitant of the old world, a cotemporary with Methuselah, who was contemporary with Adam. He had been miraculously preserved with his father and brothers when God destroyed the world by a flood; he was by the time of Abraham the father of many great nations, and he was Abraham's own progenitor. In the patriarchial state, the privilege of the first born, was to be both king and priest in the family or tribe. It was this which rendered so valuable that birth-right which was despised by Esau, and forfeited by Reuben. Shem, as the eldest son of Noah, would, of course, inherit the birth-right of the whole human race, but more particularly of his own family and descendants, after the other families and tribes were dispersed

on the confusion of tongues at Babel; and we are sure that God honoured him in the same manner as he honoured Abraham, when, he allowed himself to be called the Lord God of Shem. Gen. ix. 26. which expression implies that he was, like Abraham, the friend of God. Though, therefore, it would be presumptuous to speak positively on a subject on which the Bible is silent; yet, as matter of conjecture, I think there is no other individual mentioned in the book of Genesis, to whom the description of Melchisedec can be so properly applied.

I see no serious objection to this opinion in the account which the Apostle gives of Melchisedec, Heb. vii. 3. "Without father, without mother, without descent, having neither beginning of days, nor end of life;" for this is spoken of him, not personally, but officially; it is not said of him as a man, but as a priest; and in contrasting his priesthood with that of the order of Aaron, the meaning will more plainly appear. The priests of the order of Aaron were subject to certain laws which were peculiar to that order. It was necessary that they should be of the line of Aaron, therefore, he was their father. There was a law with regard to the marriage of the priests, which was, in effect, a law with regard to their mothers, and their descent. The priests had the beginning of their official days at thirty years of age, and the end of their official life at fifty. All this was peculiar to the order of Aaron; but Melchisedec was not subject to such laws. He did not receive his priesthood, or transmit it like the sons of Aaron; but appears a priest continually, without any record of the commencement or termination of his office, or any law with regard to the one or the other; and he is, therefore, a lively type of Him who continueth a priest for ever, not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless life.

I hope this will not appear an idle digression, when it is considered that the church of Rome rests almost the whole weight of her mass sacrifice, so far as regards scripture authority; upon the recorded fact of Melchisedec having been a priest; of Christ being declared a priest of this order; and the assumption, that Melchisedec made a sacrifice of bread and wine when he met Abraham coming from the slaughter of the kings. It is argued that if Christ be not offering himself daily, under the forms of bread and wine, he cannot be a priest of the order of Melchisedec; and therefore the sacrifice of the mass is a necessary part of the work of Christ as a priest of this order.

The argument, if it can be called an argument, is founded on the words in Genesis xiv. 18, "And Melchisedec, King of Salem, brought forth bread and wine; and he was the priest of the most high God." Plain common sense can see no more here than that this venerable priest, knowing that Abraham and his ser-

vants, who had been engaged in a very arduous work, were probably both hungry and thirsty, brought out refreshments to them, and blessed him who was their leader, knowing, no doubt, that he had been favoured by God by a revelation from Him, and a promise that the Messiah should come of his seed. From the context we learn that Abraham, on the other hand, was apprised of the office and dignity of him who honoured him with the interview; and he gave him the tithe, or tenth of the spoils which he had taken, which seems to have been understood as the proportion which God, by some intimation of his will, required to be devoted to his service; as we find afterwards, that Jacob, on making a vow to God, Gen. xxviii. 22, promised that of all that he should give him, he would give the tenth to Him in return, which was probably founded upon some known law, or approved practice among the worshippers of God in those days.

Overlooking the true meaning of the passage, the church of Rome fixes her eyes upon the words relating to Melchisedec, "He brought forth bread and wine, *and he was the priest*, (or as the Douay Bible has it, *for he was the priest*) of the Most High God," they argue as if, being a priest, he could have nothing to do with bread and wine, but to make a sacrifice of them; and they infer from this, that Christ, being a priest of his order, must continue for ever to offer sacrifice as he did.

Now I think any person who will be at the pains to read the whole passage, will see that there is not a word of sacrifice in it; and the fact of Melchisedec being called a priest does not necessarily infer that he made a sacrifice; for he exercised the priestly function in "blessing him that had the promises;" and this circumstance is enough to account for the inspired historian's being so particular, as to give him his designation of priest of the Most High God. But supposing that Melchisedec did make a sacrifice of his bread and wine, what is it to the purpose? It could not be a true figure of the sacrifice of the mass with which Papists compare it; for, according to their own doctrine, Christ never offered bread and wine in sacrifice to God; and the priests at this day do not offer bread and wine, but the real body and blood of Christ. This could have no resemblance in the bread and wine of Melchisedec, for it does not appear that either he or Abraham took them for any thing but bread and wine.

"Wherever," says Mr. Payne, late Prebendary of Westminster, "they meet with bread and wine, which are things of great antiquity, they resolve to make a sacrifice of them; especially if there be but a priest by, who has the power of consecrating; for they suppose he must presently fall to his office, and put on his habit, if bread and wine be before him; and that he cannot like other men, eat and drink them as his ordinary food, or entertain

his friends and others with them, except he not only religiously bless them by prayer and thanksgiving, which every good man ought to do, and it was the custom even of the heathens to do this before they did eat, but they must sacrifice and offer them up to God. This they will needs have Melchisedec to do in the xiv of Genesis, verse 18th. What is there here to shew that Melchisedec offered bread to God? the very word, in their own vulgar Latin, answering to the Hebrew, is *protulit*, he brought forth, not *obtulit*, he offered; and were it the latter, could not he offer bread and wine to Abraham and his company upon a table, but must it necessarily be to God upon an altar." "Bellarmine, indeed, as if he had been by at the entertainment, and had been one of Abraham's soldiers, tells us, they had eaten and drank very well before, and, therefore, desires Melchisedec to excuse them, for they had no need of his bread and wine at that time. *Bellarm. de Miss. l. 1. c. 6.*" "Why Bellarmine should cite any farther for his opinion, I cannot imagine, since the oldest of them are so much later, I suppose, and at so great a distance, from the time of Melchisedec, that they could know no more what Melchisedec did at that time than we can now, and they are very improper witnesses of a matter of fact that was so long ago, which nothing but the scripture history can give us any account of." *Discourse concerning the Sacrifice of the Mass, page 60.* That such a great author as Bellarmine should be reduced to the necessity of using such a contemptible argument, in support of the mass sacrifice, shews, pretty clearly, that no good argument was to be found in the Bible.

Bishop Hay, in his *Sincere Christian Instructed*, seems to think that he has a strong argument for the sacrifice of the mass, in these words of God to the Jewish priests by the Prophet Malachi:—"I have no pleasure in you, saith the Lord of hosts, and I will not receive a gift at your hand; for, from the rising of the sun even to his going down, my name is great among the Gentiles; and in every place there is a sacrifice, and there is offered to my name a clean offering; for my name is great among the Gentiles, saith the Lord of hosts. Mal. i. 10. "In this glorious prophecy," says the Bishop, "three things are to be remarked, (1.) That the sacrifices of the Jews were rejected,—'I will not receive a gift at your hand.' (2.) That in their place a pure offering was to be instituted; and (3.) that this clean offering and sacrifice should be offered among the Gentiles in every place, from the rising of the sun to the going down of the same, throughout the whole world. All which points to us the holy and pure sacrifice of the mass in the strongest light."

This argument of the grave prelate proves nothing but that what was very weak in itself appeared in a strong light to him.

There were many reasons why God should reject the sacrifices of the carnal Jews. They offered the blind and the lame, which would not have been accepted by their governors; but the grand defect in their offerings was, that they had lost sight of their spiritual meaning and design; and supposing the mass sacrifice to be a divinely appointed one, which it is not, I am afraid there will be found many reasons why it should be rejected as well as the sacrifices of the Jews, especially as it diverts the mind from the only sacrifice for sin with which God is well pleased.

The language of Old Testament prophecy, and sometimes of the New also, was formed upon Old Testament manners, customs, and rites. Priests and sacrifices were associated with religious worship, in the mind of every Jew, insomuch that he had no idea of worship without them. Hence it became customary to speak of spiritual worship in the language of ritual worship; and the words incense, offering, and sacrifice, came to be used to express praises, prayers, and thanksgivings, although unaccompanied by the offering of any victim, or the observance of any external rite. In some cases, indeed, the literal and the figurative language are used in the same sentence; for instance, in the xiv of Hosea, verse 2. "Take away all iniquity, and receive us graciously; so shall we render the calves of our lips;" the sacrifices are called the calves, because calves were victims usually offered in sacrifices; and by the sacrifices of the lips, we are to understand as the Apostle tells us, Heb. xiii. 15, praise to God continually, giving thanks to his name. The prophecy of Malachi, therefore, predicts, not the continuance among the Gentiles, of such sacrifices as those which were offered by the Jews, but the prevalence of spiritual worship, by a holy people, among the Gentiles, taken out from the world, or separated from it, formed by God for himself, to shew forth his praise. This is accomplished wherever the Holy Spirit makes the reading or the preaching of the word effectual for the conversion of sinners. Those who are converted are declared by the Apostle Peter to be "an holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God by Jesus Christ," and he tells us immediately what these sacrifices are, and what is the character of the priests who offer them. "Ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar people, that ye should shew forth the praises of him who hath called you out of darkness into his marvellous light," 1 Pet. ii. 5, 9. Such are the sacrifices, and such are the priests who offer them, in the New Testament church. The sacrifices are called incense and a pure offering, because they are acceptable, and pleasing to God, when presented in the name of Christ, by persons who believe in that blessed name, and whose hearts are purified through the belief of the truth. The prayers and praises of such rise up like incense, and the lifting up of their hands as the evening sac-

rifice. And every worshipper, that is, every believer in Christ, is himself a priest, because he is consecrated and devoted to the service of God, to offer up spiritual sacrifices.

Bishop Hay seems to lay some stress on the expression "pure offering," which he changes into *clean* offering, and which he contrasts under this character with the Jewish sacrifices, as if they had all been *dirty* ones: and, indeed, such they were in a literal sense; for no priest could kill an animal, and separate the parts, without contracting some defilement; whereas it must be allowed that a Popish priest may offer a wafer, and a cup of wine too, without being under the necessity of afterwards washing his hands; but these ideas are childish and carnal; and ought to have no place in the mind of a person who wishes to understand the nature of spiritual worship. The man who slew a bullock as a sacrifice to God, understanding the meaning of what he did, and believing in the promised Saviour, who was to give himself for the sins of the world, offered a pure, or if you will, a clean offering, though his hands and his clothes were besmeared with the blood of the animal; whereas the *clean* offering of bread and wine, or of the body and blood of Christ under the appearances of bread and wine, which God hath not required, is an abomination in his sight.

There is nothing more common, even, in the New Testament, than to speak of the duties of Christians under the name of sacrifices. "To do good and to communicate forget not, for with such sacrifices God is well pleased." Heb. xiii. 16. And as the believers in Philippi had been mindful of Paul in his affliction, and had sent something repeatedly to relieve his necessities, he speaks of what they had done to him as "an odour of a sweet sinell, a sacrifice acceptable, well pleasing to God." Phil. iv. 18. This was the very thing of which Malachi had spoken; it was incense and a pure offering to God among the Gentiles.

I find I have made a mistake in my last Number, page 100, which I hasten to correct. By reading the first clause of Heb. x. v. 2, as an assertion instead of a question, I have given an erroneous view of the Apostle's argument. I represented him as saying, if legal sacrifices could have taken away sin, they would *not* have ceased to be offered, that is, they would not have been superseded by another and a better one, because they would, themselves, have effected the purpose of an atoning sacrifice, on behalf of those who were interested in them. But the Apostle's meaning is, that if such sacrifices could have taken away sin, they *would have ceased to be offered*; they would not have been repeated on behalf of the same persons; for the worshippers *once* purged, would have had no more conscience of sins. This makes the argument against the repetition of Christ sacrifice much stronger than I represented it. It is not a sufficient apology for such a mistake, but I mention it as a fact, that my last Number was written amidst innumerable interruptions; and I had not much time for revision.

THE

Protestant,

No. LXV.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 9th, 1819.

WHEN Melchisedec brought forth bread and wine to refresh Abraham and his troops, he gave an example of hospitality worthy of one who was a king as well as a priest. The example was honourable to him who gave it, and to him who received the benefit; and this is all that we are taught by the narrative of the inspired historian, so far as relates to the bread and wine which were presented on the occasion. But unless we allow that Melchisedec made a sacrifice of his bread and wine, and a propitiatory sacrifice too, we can find nothing in the circumstance which in the least resembles the sacrifice of the mass; and though the action of Melchisedec had been that of a sacrifice, as he offered nothing but bread and wine, and not the real body and blood of Christ, under the forms of bread and wine, it would be no example to the Popish priests of the present day, who do not profess to make a sacrifice of the elements, but of the real body and blood of the Saviour.

All Popish writers of any note, for three or four centuries, have laboured hard to press Melchisedec into the service of their church, and to make his hospitality an act of sacrifice; but they find that this alone will not serve their purpose: they must have the priesthood of Christ, which is declared to be after the order of Melchisedec, to consist principally, if not entirely, in the continual offering of himself, by the hands of his priests, under the forms of bread and wine; and without this they say, he cannot be a priest for ever of the order of Melchisedec. The holy doctors of Rheims, in their annotation on Heb. vii. 17. endeavour to

establish this point, upon the authority of ancient fathers, and having lost their temper, they fall a cursing, and say, in relation to such authority, “If nothing will serve our adversaries, *Christ Jesus confound them!* and defend his eternal priesthood, and state of his New Testament established in the same.”

There is nothing more common than for persons who have lost temper, to shew that they have lost reason too. In their simplicity, the grave doctors, in a note upon another passage of the same Epistle, let out the secret, that the Apostle did not teach the doctrine of the mass sacrifice, or any thing like it, but that it was one of those things which he could not inculcate, on account of the people’s want of capacity to learn. I will give their own translation, and their note upon it, Heb. v. 8—11. “And truly whereas he was a Son, he learned by those things which he suffered, obedience: and being consummate, was made to all that obey him cause of eternal salvation, called of God a high priest according to the order of Melchisedec. Of whom we have great speech and inexplicable to utter: because you are become weak to hear.” Annotation, “Inexplicable.” Intending to treat more largely and particularly of Christ’s or Melchisedec’s priesthood, he forewarneth them that the mystery thereof is far passing their capacity, and that through their feebleness in faith, and weakness of understanding, he is forced to omit divers deep points concerning the priesthood of the new law. Among which (no doubt) the mystery of the sacrament and sacrifice of the altar, called *MASS*, was a principal and pertinent matter: which the apostles and fathers of the primitive church used not to treat of so largely and particularly in their writings, which might come to the hands of the unfaithful, who of all things took soonest scandal of the blessed sacrament, as we see, John vi. He spake to the Hebrews (saith S. Hierom ep. 126) that is, to the Jews, and not to the faithful men to whom he might have been bold to utter the sacrament. And indeed it was not reasonable to talk much to them of that sacrifice which was the resemblance of Christ’s death, when they thought not right of Christ’s death itself. Much the Apostle’s wisdom and silence our adversaries wickedly abuse against the holy *Mass*.”

As I am one of those adversaries, whom nothing that the church of Rome has yet advanced in defence of her mass sacrifice will satisfy, I suppose I must be classed with those whom the reverend fathers call upon Christ Jesus to confound. But big words are not always great arguments; and without the least fear or dread of their great anathema, I maintain that the Church of Rome has not produced the authority of any one of the ancient fathers in support of her mass sacrifice, as it is defined by the Council of Trent, and taught in her catechisms. If

the fathers had been such children as to believe and teach the doctrine of the mass, I would not give a farthing for their authority; and indeed, great men though some of them were, I attach no importance to their writings, further than as they bear witness to matters of fact which came within their own knowledge, and as affording specimens of the literature of their times. In matters of Christian doctrine, which are contained in the Bible, they had not better access to know the truth than we have, and few of them such good opportunities as we possess, with the entire volume of inspiration in our hands, and liberty to study it night and day if we please.

But in point of fact, I have seen nothing quoted from any of the ancient fathers which gives the least countenance to the Popish doctrine of the mass. It is true, some of them use very improper and unscriptural language with regard to the Lord's supper, such, for instance, as, "This tremendous sacrament." "A host or sacrifice that cannot be consumed." "An host which being taken away there would be no religion." "A perpetual oblation and a redemption that runneth or continueth everlastingly." (Chrysostom, Cyprian, and others, as quoted by the Rhemish doctors, on Heb. vii. 17. and other annotations on this Epistle.) Such expressions prove nothing more than that such authors had an erroneous view of the subject, and an absurd and fanciful way of speaking of it: but there is not the least hint of their having believed the bread and wine in the eucharist, as the Lord's supper was called, to be converted into the real body and blood of Christ, and as such, offered to God as a propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead.

Besides, we ought to be very cautious in receiving any thing which Papists profess to give as the sentiments, or even the words of the ancient fathers. We have in Glasgow a man who professes to know something of literature, who subscribes himself *AMICUS VERITATIS*, that is, a friend of the truth, and who follows one of the learned professions, who had the effrontery to give to the Glasgow public what he called an extract from the works of Luther, in which he broke off in the middle of a sentence, and substituted a period for a comma; by which means he made Luther speak very differently from what he intended: of which see an exposure in my second Number. This writer had the still greater effrontery to refer me to the volume and folio of Luther's works, in the library of the Glasgow University, and to challenge me to go and see if Luther did not teach the lawfulness of adultery. I did go, and I found that the pretended friend of truth was a publisher of falsehood; for Luther's words, given entire, bear no such meaning.

Now, if such a circumstance could happen in the nineteenth century, in the enlightened city of Glasgow, what may not have happened in the comparative darkness of the sixteenth century,

and in places where few could read? In point of fact there happened innumerable instances of forgery and imposition at an earlier period than this, of which I have in my possession a numerous catalogue, in a volume entitled "Roman Forgeries." * Works were ascribed to certain fathers, and some even to apostles, which such apostles and fathers never saw or heard of; and the works of the fathers which are allowed to be genuine, have been so garbled, as in many instances to conceal their real meaning; of which take the following account from a lively and interesting pamphlet by the Rev. Mr. Carlile of Dublin.

Speaking of the authority which the Church of Rome exercises, he says,—“ They exercise a singular authority over the writings of the fathers. They have carefully examined them, and made out a list of passages that are to be expunged as erroneous, which they call the *Index Expurgatorius*. They prohibit the publication of these passages; and when they get copies of the fathers within their reach, they correct them as they call it, according to the Index. If any one wishes to see an instance of this with his own eyes, let him examine the copy of the edition of St. Hierom's works, published by Erasmus, in the library of Trinity College, Dublin. He will see on the title pages of the different volumes, a certificate, signed in the name of the Inquisitor General, who derives his authority from the Pope, stating that the volume had been examined and corrected according to the *Index Expurgatorius*; and, on turning over the leaves of the book, he will find passages carefully blotted out with ink. He will also observe, that wherever the name of Erasmus occurs, he is styled a damned author, “ *auctor damnatus* ;” and the reason of this title is stated to be his editing the book without purgation. There is a kind of melancholy pleasure in seeing the hand-writing of an Inquisitor in the execution of his office, when one is out of his reach—a similar pleasure to what one feels on seeing a tyger in his cage.”

I have not quoted Mr. Carlile as an authority for the existence of the *Index Expurgatorius*, for this is known to every man who has read what is called church history; but for the information which he gives of an example of the manner in which books are garbled according to the Index, of which he was an eye-witness, and which may be seen by any person who will visit the library of Trinity College, Dublin. Now, it is very evident that no credit is due to what Popish writers are pleased to give as the words of the fathers; for their works are mutilated by authority, so as not to speak what they did speak. If one of them, for instance, should have called the Lord's supper a sacrifice, and have added that he

* See a very copious list of Romish, as well as heathen literary forgeries, in Arliss' Pocket Magazine for last month, page 144.

meant it only eucharistically and spiritually, and not as propitiatory; then, according to the rules of the Index, the last clause would be expunged, as not according to the faith of the church; and so, by suppressing the author's explanation of his meaning, they make him speak what he did not mean.

The clergy of the Church of Rome were in possession of almost all the literature in Europe for several centuries. They alone had access to the writings of the fathers; and, in taking copies of them, before the art of printing was invented, it was easy for them to make such additions and omissions as would represent the fathers as speaking whatever they pleased. Or, supposing that the monks and priests of the dark ages were men who had some conscience, and would not be guilty of such imposition, we know what villany was practised in a more enlightened age; when, after the invention of printing, the Church of Rome was publicly and avowedly guilty of the very imposition above mentioned. By her Index Expurgatorius she makes the fathers teach what she pleases, though it should be the very opposite of what they actually did teach; and when an honest man like Erasmus, (honest in this point I mean), takes upon him to publish the genuine works of the fathers, without interpolation or omission, they call him a "damned author."

Without ceremony, therefore, I dismiss the fathers and their opinions, as adduced by the Rhemish translators and other Popish authors, as of no weight whatever with regard to the point in hand; and I shall now take up the argument of the Rhemish doctors, in support of the mass, which they affect to find in the vth of Hebrews, v. 8—11 above quoted.

They find out that the mass "was a principal and pertinent matter" among those things which the Apostle did not think proper to make known to the Hebrew believers. That he did not teach any such thing is certain; and that he had such a thing among many things which were hard to be uttered, and which he forebore teaching, remains to be proved. If the mass sacrifice were, as Papists represent it, the principal part of Christian worship; if it were, as they say, that essential and solemn rite, without which there is no Christianity, it would seem very strange that the Apostle should be silent on the subject. He must have, in that case, departed from his usual course of integrity and faithfulness. To the Ephesian elders he could say, I have not shunned to declare unto you the whole counsel of God; and therefore, as he says, he was pure from the blood of all men. Acts xx. 26, 27. But he did not declare the whole counsel of God to the Hebrews; he was not pure from their blood, if he allowed them to remain ignorant of the propitiatory sacrifice of the mass, and to die without the benefit of it: nay, if the mass sacrifice be of the counsel of God, and of such importance as the church of Rome says it is, then

the Apostle must have been guilty of the blood of those who died ignorant of it. But I hope every Christian will pronounce a verdict of not guilty, in favour of the Apostle, till it be proved that he received a command from Christ to teach the doctrine of the mass.

But it will perhaps be objected, that the Apostle did keep back something which he would have told the Hebrews had they been able to understand it; to which I reply, that no such thing appears from his own words. Concerning Melchisedec and his priesthood, as typical of that of Christ, he had much to say, not inexplicable, as the Rhemists make it, not a thing in itself unintelligible; but a thing difficult to be explained to persons whose minds were so imbued with Jewish prejudices as to give tardy and hesitating admittance to evangelical truths. There are many truths which appear to a mathematician as certain and evident as that two and three make five, which he would find it difficult, and even impossible, to bring down to the understanding of a person who had not studied mathematics. Though the Apostle's own mind was perfectly clear upon the subject of Christ's priesthood, and the termination of that of Aaron, he found it hard to bring the subject down to the understanding of persons who were still wishing to cling to the priesthood of Aaron, and other Jewish institutions. Notwithstanding, however, the dulness of their apprehension, the Apostle proposes nothing less than to lead them on to perfection; and he does tell them all that he had to say about Melchisedec and his priesthood, in the seventh chapter of his epistle. It is therefore unjust and injurious to the memory of the Apostle to say, that he kept any thing back that he was commissioned and inspired to teach.

But this is not all,—the Rhemish doctors represent the holy and faithful Apostle as a time-server and a Jesuit; as teaching what was agreeable to the people, and keeping back what he supposed would be disagreeable and unpopular. The apostles and fathers of the primitive church, they say, “used not to treat so largely and particularly (of the mass) in their writings, which might come to the hands of the unfaithful, who of all things took soonest scandal of the blessed sacrament, as we see, John vi.” The passage in John vi. does not refer to the sacrament at all, as any one may see who will read it; but supposing the mass to have been a doctrine which the Apostle was commissioned to teach, the circumstance of its being the soonest to excite scandal, so far from inducing him to keep it back, would only have led him to give it a more prominent place in his ministrations. He knew that the doctrine of Christ crucified was the most scandalous thing in Christianity. It was a stumbling-block to the Jews, and foolishness to the Gentiles; but instead of keeping it back on that account, he declared that he would know nothing else—he would.

make it the sum and substance of all his discourses to both Gentiles and Jews. So he did : and had the mass been a part of Christianity, the more it was contemned by the world, the more zealously he would have maintained it. It is said, indeed, that some Jesuits in China, and other heathen countries, conceal those parts of Christianity that are likely to be offensive to those whom they wish to convert ; but the apostolical character was not formed upon the model of Jesuitism.

The Rhemish doctors seem to take it for granted, that the apostles were such men as themselves. They did not, they say, treat largely and particularly of the mass sacrifice, lest their writings should come into the " hands of the unfaithful." Here it is insinuated, that they had something to conceal from adversaries ; something that would not bear the light. Now, though this may be true of the sacrifice of the mass, it is most untrue of any thing that apostles preached and wrote. They had nothing to conceal. What Christ had told them in private, he commanded them to publish upon the house tops. The apostles addressed themselves to adversaries. They demanded their attention, and invited them to scrutinize in the strictest manner, all that they spake and wrote. Had the mass, therefore, been a part of what they were commanded to teach, they would not have attempted to conceal it from adversaries. It is this smuggling, this attempt at concealment, that has given infidel writers such a footing in countries called Christian. It is the boast of such writers that Christianity cannot bear the light ; that therefore it is an imposition ; and those who see Christianity only in the light of Popery can scarcely come to any other conclusion. Thus the church of Rome has added to all her other guilt that of the infidelity which her impieties and absurdities have produced. Infidels are without excuse, because they ought to view Christianity as it is laid down in the word of God ; but the church of Rome has done what she could to keep this from them.

Our grave doctors of Rheims next introduce St. Hierom talking as great nonsense as themselves. The Apostle, says he, " spake to the Hebrews, that is, to the Jews, and not to the faithful men to whom he might have been bold to utter the sacrament." The Apostle was indeed speaking to Jews,—to Jews who laboured under many mistakes, and who were very dull of apprehension with regard to many things ; but who were, upon the whole, not enemies, but friends—real believers in Christ, concerning whom he says, " God is not unrighteous to forget your work and labour of love, which you have shewn to his name." chap. vi. 10. Again, " ye took joyfully the spoiling of your goods, knowing that ye have in heaven a better, and an enduring substance." chap. x. 34. This is not such a speech as an apostle would have made to adversaries of the gospel ; it was an address

to friends, to whom he might, in the fullest confidence, have opened up all the mysteries of the mass, had there been any such mysteries in his time; he might have been as bold as he pleased upon this subject; for he was speaking to faithful men, to whom he says many bold things, and things likely to have been more offensive than the doctrine of the mass, had he been authorised to teach such a doctrine.

“And indeed,” say the Rhemish doctors, “it was not reasonable to talk much to them of that sacrifice which was the resemblance of Christ’s death, when they thought not rightly of Christ’s death itself.” They proceed upon the notion that the Epistle to the Hebrews was addressed to the unbelieving Jews, who were avowed enemies of Christ and his gospel; but this was not the case, as any man may see who reads the epistle itself. The Apostle addresses the Hebrews as brethren in the faith of the gospel, notwithstanding their mistakes and imperfections. Indeed there are none of the apostolic epistles addressed to persons of an opposite character. The apostles preached the gospel to sinners of every description, in order that sinners, believing, might be saved; but all their letters are addressed to Christians—to individuals or churches who made a profession of the faith; and who were not therefore understood to be adversaries, to whom it would have been improper or unsafe to intrust any matter of divine revelation, or inculcate any Christian doctrine. It follows, therefore, inevitably, that as the apostles did not inculcate the doctrine of the mass sacrifice, they had received no such doctrine from Christ; and it must be regarded, as it really is, an impious, human, or perhaps rather diabolical invention.

Protestants are accused of wickedly abusing the Apostle’s wisdom and silence against the holy mass. It would be well if Papists could find no greater wickedness in Protestants than their not believing what apostles did not teach. On the subject of the mass, it seems by the Rhemish doctors’ own account, it was the Apostle’s wisdom to be silent. Then, one would think, if modern Papists had any wisdom, they would follow his example. The apostles and fathers, they say, did not treat largely on this subject in their writings, lest those should come into the hands of the unfaithful. Why then do Popish writers treat so largely of the mass sacrifice, and make it the principal part of the Christian religion? Their works are in as much danger of coming into the hands of the unfaithful as the writings of apostles were. The truth is, there is no such doctrine in the Bible, and the holy fathers of Rheims confess as much, when they admit that the apostles were silent upon it.

THE

Protestant,

No. LXVI.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 16th, 1819.

AMONG the numerous errors connected with the doctrine of the mass, there is one which deserves to be exposed by itself. It is that which represents the Romish priests not only as sacrificers, but also as mediators between God and man. The one character might, indeed, be considered as implied in the other, when it is understood that they profess to offer a real propitiatory sacrifice for sins. But they do not leave it to be implied and inferred. They plainly and unequivocally profess to be mediators between God and the people. For this we have the authority of the work entitled "Holy Altar and Sacrifice explained," by "Father Pacificus Baker, of the order of St. Francis," which is the most full and particular treatise on the subject of the mass that has come in my way. It is in the form of a dialogue between a teacher and a learner. The teacher having described the use and meaning of the holy vestments, such as the albe, the girdle, the stole, the maniple, and the chasuble, the learner is introduced as saying, "What you have said is extremely *entertaining and instructive*; will you add a word or two concerning the priestly function, and of the respect due to priests? for certainly as they are ministers of God, and *mediators* between him and his people, a proper respect and reverence is due to them from those, in whose regard they are thus consecrated ministers of God." This shows, no doubt, a very amiable and teachable disposition on the part of the young disciple, and a willingness to be initiated into all the duties and reverences which he ought to pay to his ghostly fathers; and the ghostly father of a teacher does instruct and encourage him as follows:—

“ You say very right : their function being to offer up sacrifices, as all ages and laws declare. There were priests set apart in the law of nature, as well as in the Mosaic institute, whose peculiar business was to offer sacrifices for themselves and others. In the new law, priests are ordained to offer up the great sacrifice of the mass : for this they are consecrated, and, in their ordination, the bishop says to them, ‘ Receive power of offering sacrifice in the church, for the living and the dead.’ Consequently to this, there is most certainly a due reverence to be paid to them ; as, first, on account of their dignity, being God’s vicars on earth, his ministers to instruct, direct, and feed his people, as so many sheep committed to their care. Hence, St. Austin says, ‘ There is no greater dignity under heaven, than that of God’s priests, consecrated to deliver the heavenly sacraments to us.’ Secondly, for their utility, and the benefits we receive by them in their preaching, instruction, and administering the holy sacraments. Thirdly, as they are *mediators between God and us*, their business being to pray and intercede in behalf of the people, according to what God said to Moses and Aaron, speaking of the priests : ‘ They shall invoke my name upon the children of Israel ; and I, the Lord, will bless them.’ Numb. vi. Lastly, in respect of the power given to them by God, to bind and loose on earth ; to forgive sins, in the sacrament of penance, and to consecrate the sacred body and blood of Christ in the holy eucharist. Let me add the words of St. Chrysostome : ‘ What can be said but that all power of heavenly things is granted to them by God ; for he says, ‘ Whose sins ye retain, they are retained. St. John xx. What power can be greater than this ? The Father gave all power to the Son, and I see this power given to priests by God the Son. St. Bernard admires it, saying, ‘ O excellent, and honourable power of priests, to which nothing in heaven, nothing on earth, can be compared.’ Hence the admonition of St. Francis, to reverence and honour priests ; because, says he, ‘ They administer the most holy body and blood of Christ, which they alone consecrate, receive, and give to others.’ ”

The honours thus conferred upon priests will, I believe, be allowed to be sufficiently extravagant ; and it must not be forgotten, that all these high things are said of them by persons who are priests themselves, and who have, therefore, an interest in maintaining the dignity of their order. It is here intimated, that the same power which God the Father gave to the Son, the Son has given to the priests ; and this will, of course, bring them into the station which they assume, that of being mediators between God and man. I am aware that the third article, in the above extract, taken by itself, might be explained as limiting the mean-

ing of the word to persons who merely pray and intercede for the people; but when the words are taken in connection with the other characters given of the priests, as God's vicars on earth, as consecrated to offer propitiatory sacrifices, and having all power in heavenly things granted to them, it is evident that the author means to represent them as mediators, in a much higher sense of the word.

Now, this is one of the greatest instances of impiety and presumption that perhaps ever entered into the mind of man. We are told, in the New Testament, that there is *one* God, and *one* Mediator between God and man, the Man Christ Jesus. 1 Tim. ii. 5. And the language of the Apostle points out as plainly the *one* Mediator to the exclusion of all others, as it points out *one* God to the exclusion of all others. To suppose, therefore, that there are many mediators is as impious as to suppose that there are many Gods. And to be sure, as the Church of Rome has set up gods and goddesses without number, under the designation of saints and saintesses, she may be allowed to multiply mediators, in proportion to the number of the objects of her worship.

He that is a mediator between God and man must stand upon a footing of perfect friendship with God—must never have offended him; else, instead of being a mediator for others, he would require a mediator for himself; and he must be one of infinite dignity and worth, that, in consideration of his obedience and suffering for sin, God will grant pardon to the sinner.—Christ stands upon this footing; and he only is qualified to act the part of a Mediator; but as for the Romish priests, who are they? To say the very best that can be said, they are sinners, like other men; and to say the truth, many of them are greater sinners than others. I could give such an account of them, by writers of their own communion, as would shock every reader; and are these fit to be mediators between a holy God and his sinful creatures? The idea cannot be, for a moment, entertained by any person who knows what sin is, and what holiness is. The Reverend Father Baker himself admits the fact, that some, at least, of his *mediators* are of the character here mentioned; for after uttering a prayer, at least an earnest wish, “that all who are called to this high and sacred dignity, would endeavour to adorn their sublime character by suitable, holy, regular, and exemplary lives; to instruct and incite others to piety and holiness of life, by example as well as by preaching; that the sacred function may not be brought into contempt, and made a ridicule, on account of disedifying and irregular behaviour;” he immediately adds, “May God, of his mercy, remove this evil from the sanctuary.” The matter of the prayer is good; but it pro-

ceeds upon the fact that such an evil did exist, and was suffered in the church; as is evident indeed from all history; and the Church of Rome actually tolerates and makes herself responsible for the evil, by maintaining that the ministry of the most wicked priests is a good ministry; that the sacrifice of the mass offered by them is a good and propitiatory sacrifice; that, in short, they are mediators between God and men, as if they were perfectly holy and without sin. This certainly is calculated to bring religion into contempt; to give a false view of the character of God, with whom such men are said to mediate, as if he were such a one as themselves, and would treat with the vilest of the human race. Such a misrepresentation of the divine character is calculated to lead to infidelity, and even to atheism itself.

But, though all the Romish priests were as holy men as Noah, Daniel, and Job, they could not be mediators between God and man. This honour is reserved for Christ alone; and the fact of the priests arrogating it to themselves is one, among a hundred evidences, that they put themselves in the place of the Saviour of the world.

It is no doubt a matter of great importance to the Romish priests to get themselves acknowledged as mediators with God, on behalf of their fellow creatures; for this flatters their pride, and fills the minds of those who confide in them with the most awful reverence of their sacred function, and leads their blinded followers to yield them implicit obedience. But the principal value of the mass sacrifice consists in the great sums of money which it brings into the coffers of the church. A writer, whom I quoted in my introduction to this subject, justly remarks, that the revenue arising from the mass alone, enables the church to keep more priests in pay than any prince in Christendom can maintain soldiers. Even in our own country, especially in Ireland, the sums which are raised by Popish priests, from the poor people, by means of the mass alone, are beyond all calculation.

A kind friend in Dublin has favoured me with copies of four authentic documents, which exhibit, in a striking manner, the impositions which are practised upon the poor deluded people, by the priests, by means of their masses, in order to extort money from them. My correspondent, along with these documents, writes as follows:—"A few evenings ago, I had occasion to call upon the Rev. Mr. C——, when, among other matters, **THE PROTESTANT** became the subject of conversation. You are aware of its having excited a considerable interest in this place; and that it is the wish of many, who rejoice to see the cause of the Redeemer triumph over the man of sin, to hear of the prosperity, and continued usefulness of that publication. Mr. C. mentioned having received, a few days since, four receipts,

granted by priests belonging to some of the chapels in town, to individuals, for money paid by them for masses said in behalf of the souls of their departed friends. These documents, he conceived, might be of use to you, and as he knew I was occasionally writing to my brother in Glasgow, requested me to inclose a few lines to you, with copies of these documents. The original receipts I return to Mr. C. who authorises me to say, that they will be at your service at a moment's notice, should you at any time have occasion for them. I copy them precisely as they are written, agreeably to their dates."—"It is difficult, even in this country, to get possession of such strong proofs of the dreadful depravity and wickedness of these blind leaders of the blind; for though we hear from undoubted authority, almost every week, of immense sums being obtained in this way from their deluded votaries; yet I believe they are exceedingly cautious of giving any written acknowledgement for the amount to any but those in whom they think they may, without danger, place implicit confidence." The writer of the above, though a stranger to me, is well known in this city; and the reader may rely upon the accuracy of his statement. The copies of receipts, with which he has furnished me are as follow:—

"Oct. 17th, 1798.—An account of the Masses said for the soul of the late Mrs. Monaghan:—

St. James' chapel,	50 Masses	£2 14 2
Denmark St. chapel,	20	1 1 8
Stephen St. chapel,	20	1 1 8
Ash St. chapel,	20	1 1 8
<hr/>		
110 Masses,		5 19 2

Received the above, in full, this 17th Oct. 1798.

M. M'Guire."

"Dublin, July 11th, 1809.—Received from Mrs. Mahon, two pounds, three shillings and four pence, for twenty Masses, offered up by the Rev. Gentlemen of St. James' chapel, for the repose of the soul of Mr. Timothy Mahon.

£2:3:4.

Jas. Jos. Callan."

"12th Oct. 1809.—Received from Mrs. Mahon, two pounds, three and four pence, for twenty Masses, said by the Rev. Gentlemen of St. James' chapel, for the soul of Mrs. Mary Monaghan.

Jas. Jos. Callan."

"Dublin, Oct. 31st.—Received from Mrs. Mahon, three pounds, eight and three pence, for sixty Masses, offered up in St James' chapel, for the repose of the soul of Mrs. Monaghan.

£3:8:3.

Jas. Jos. Callan."

These documents will show in what manner our poor deluded fellow subjects in Ireland are cheated out of their money, by their ghostly guides. The Apostle Peter, or St. Peter as they call him, is one of the great idols of the Church of Rome; but if their practice be right, the Apostle was wrong, when he reproved Simon Magus for supposing that the gift of God was to be purchased with money. In the Church of Rome there is no *gift* at all; every thing is matter of purchase; and nothing is to be had without money. The gospel, indeed, declares pardon and peace to the soul of every believer, as the free gift of God by Jesus Christ; but the Romish priests do most impudently place themselves between God and men as mediators, and their mediatorship consists chiefly, if not entirely, in receiving money for that which God has promised to bestow freely. Were the same thing to take place in the affairs of this life;—were a rich man, for instance, to invite all the poor of his neighbourhood to come to his hall, and receive a dinner every day for nothing; and were his steward to admit none but those who paid him a price for their dinner, would not all the world cry out against the extortion, injustice, and cruelty, of such a hard-hearted wretch, and reckon that Botany Bay was too good for him? Yet the case which I have supposed is nothing, in point of cruelty and villany, when compared with that of the Romish priests, who set a price upon those spiritual blessings which the Almighty gives without money and without price.

From the tenor of the above receipts it appears, that money was demanded and paid for the purpose of procuring, by means of a number of masses, repose to the souls of certain persons deceased. Had these persons died in the faith of Christ, their souls would have been at rest with him in heaven; and to extort money from their surviving relatives, for the purpose of procuring them rest, was downright robbery. If they did not die in the faith of Christ, but in their sins, it was not in the power of all the priests in Europe, although fee'd by all the wealth of the Indies, to procure one moment of rest to their souls; and, therefore, on this supposition, as well as upon the other, to extort money from surviving friends for the purpose, was downright robbery. Our Glasgow Papists, and their ghostly guides, know better than I can tell them, how much money is picked out of the pockets of the poor every week, under the false pretext of procuring repose to the souls of their deceased friends, by means of masses said in their behalf, which are of no more value, and have no more virtue, than the dust of their chapel would have, if offered as the price of their salvation.

If the mass were really a propitiatory sacrifice for the dead as well as the living, one would expect that one mass would be

enough for one dead person. It would be unreasonable, and even unjust, to exact more than that which made propitiation, or atonement, for the sins of the individual in whose behalf it was offered; but, in the case of Mrs. Monaghan, above cited, we find no fewer than one hundred and ten masses, said in different chapels; that is, one hundred and ten propitiatory sacrifices offered up for the repose of the soul of one person! What can be the meaning of this? Truly nothing less than that the priests might receive 110 British shillings, each equal to thirteen pence Irish, which, I suppose, is the lowest price of such merchandise in Dublin. Mrs. Mahon seems to have paid twice as much when she bespoke only twenty at a time, which would be considered only a retail job; but when she engaged the wholesale number of sixty, she got them for the slump sum of £3 : 8 : 3d. which is only a trifle more than a shilling a piece. Even this would likely be considered a high price by such foreign merchants as knew of a cheaper market; and I have been informed that a certain Irish gentleman, who had a correspondent in Lisbon, applied to him for a quantity of masses for the soul of a deceased friend, and that he got them 50 per cent. cheaper than they could be had in Dublin; which, I suppose, was owing to the cheapness of labour in Lisbon; priests being there, as weavers are at present in Scotland, too numerous to admit of their being paid a comfortable price for their commodity.

The friends of Mrs. Monaghan seem to have sought for the blessing of peace to her soul, upon the same principle as Balak, king of Moab, sought for curses upon the children of Israel. They made trial of four different places; being doubtful, I suppose, that they would not find what they wanted, at any one place. This is another of the cheats which the priests practise, in order to rob the poor people of their money. They hold out the accumulated merit of a great many masses, said at many different holy places; but they take care never to tell how many will be sufficient to relieve a soul. Like the grave and the horse leech, they never have enough; and their deluded adherents can never be sure, that the object for which they have given so much money is accomplished. If the soul of Mrs. Monaghan required 110 masses, how could Mrs. Mahon satisfy her conscience with no more than twenty for her husband, or her son, Timothy? In short there are no limits to the number of masses that a soul may require, but the limits of the purses of surviving friends; and no man can be sure that he has obtained the relief of a soul from purgatory, while he has a shilling left, and a priest to receive it.

In Popish countries, such as Spain, when a person is dangerously ill, the priests and friars beset the house, like so many harpies, waiting till they know the event; and if the person die

they assail the chief of the family, with petitions for saying masses for the dead. If the family be rich, the custom is to distribute among the convents and parishes, a thousand or more masses to be said on the day of the burial. "When the Marquis of St. Martin died," says Mr. Gavin, in his *Master Key*, "his lady distributed a hundred thousand masses, for which she paid five thousand pounds sterling, besides a thousand masses which she settled upon all the convents and parish churches, to be said every year for ever, which amounts to a thousand pistoles a year."

But not satisfied with cheating the people out of their money, the priests cheat them also out of the masses, which they have bargained and paid for; for it often happens that they receive more money for masses in a day, than they can say in a month. But they have recourse to a special privilege which the Pope has granted, and which the priests and friars keep as a secret among themselves. Mr. Gavin confesses that, while he was among them, he never saw the privilege or bull to that effect, though he wished to see it; but it was a thing secretly understood among his brethren, that they had authority from the Pope to make one mass serve for a hundred. This was called a *centenaria missa*; and the mass which was said in name of the hundred, was understood to have as much efficacy as another one said a hundred times. I have no doubt this was actually the case; and the Pope, by another act of his spiritual power, could easily make one mass serve for a thousand. But it would not do to make this public; for the people give their money under a conviction, that the masses which they pay for, are said in full tale, and to undeceive them would have a deplorable effect upon the ghostly exchequer.

By the author of the "*Master Key*" we are informed farther, that the dealers in masses keep a sort of stock account, like that which our dealers in foreign and British spirits keep with the Excise Office, out of which, by means of a permit, a quantity may be transferred from one person to another. "If somebody dieth," saith Mr. Gavin, vol. 1. page 136, "and the executors of the testament go to a father prior, and beg of him to say a thousand masses, he gives them a receipt, whereby the masses are said already; for he makes them believe that he has more masses said already by his friars to his own intention; and that, out of that number, he applies a thousand for the soul of the dead person."

THE

Protestant,

No. LXVII.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 25d, 1819.

I HAVE received, from some of my readers, pretty broad hints that they are tired of transubstantiation and the sacrifice of the mass; and I will not conceal from them the fact, that I am tired of them too. There is so much of absurdity and impiety involved in the doctrine and practice of the Church of Rome, on these two points alone, that there is no more necessary than a small portion of common sense, and knowledge of the Bible, to convince any one who turns his attention to it, that the whole system is antichristian, and no better than mere heathenism. This appears so plainly to my intelligent readers, that they can scarcely perceive the necessity or propriety of such *lengthy* dissertations as I have written on these subjects; but I hope such persons will consider the condition of many Papists who read my papers, and of many Protestants, not so well informed as themselves, who need to be taught the very first principles of Christianity, which are closely connected with the subject of my late Numbers; and though there are many who know these things as well or better than I can tell them, yet, for the sake of others, who have not such knowledge, and who require line upon line, and precept upon precept, they will bear with what I have written, though it should seem to them more than enough, and though I may have made many repetitions.

I have now done with the doctrinal errors of the mass; but, there are some things of a practical nature, which are worthy of being mentioned. These are things of which Protestants know but little, but with which Papists are perfectly acquainted. The latter will, therefore, I hope, bear with me, while I give a detail

R

of some particulars, of which they do not need to be informed. They cannot but consider this a very reasonable request, seeing that, for their sakes, I have imposed upon my Protestant readers, the task of perusing some long dry dissertations, which are no better than what they hear from the pulpit every Sabbath day.

In my last Number, I alluded to the Reverend Father Baker's explanation of the use and meaning of the sacred vestments, which are used in the celebration of mass. I introduced a docile young Papist, as acknowledging that this was "extremely entertaining and instructive." Now, I wish my Protestant readers to know and understand what sort of things they are by which Papists are entertained and instructed; and, I am verily persuaded, I shall be told by not a few, that they never heard of such things before.

Know then, that the vestments, or robes, with which the priests adorn their persons, on saying mass, are of five different colours, white, red, green, purple and black; and these colours are used on the following occasions: "White is used on all the feasts of our blessed Lord, blessed lady, bishops, confessors, confessors not bishops, abbots, virgins, and holy women, not martyrs, on the feasts of dedication of churches, within the octaves of festivals, when the mass is said of the octave, on all Sundays, from Easter inclusive, to Pentecost exclusive; on Trinity Sunday, and till the octave of *Corpus Christi*.

"Red is used on the vigil of Pentecost, and during the octave, Trinity Sunday excepted. On the feasts of the holy cross, of apostles and martyrs, and octave masses of the Holy Ghost.

"Green is used on all Sundays, from Trinity Sunday till Advent, and on the Sundays after the octave of the Epiphany, when mass is said of the Sunday; but, on Sundays within any octave, the colour is of the respective octave. Green is also used on all Ferias, or week days, unless within octaves or Sundays, from Septuagesimo till Thursday in holy week, and during Advent.

"Purple is used on all Sundays in Advent, and on all Sundays from Septuagesimo till Palm Sunday, inclusive; as also on all Ferias during those times; and on all vigils and fasting days, when the mass is of them.

"Black is used on Good Friday, All Souls' day, and while the mass is said for the dead."

To all this, the pupil, whose name is Theotime, replies: "Hitherto you have perfectly satisfied me; tell me now how many are the particular vestments the priest is clad with, how they are called, and the signification of them?"

In reply, says the teacher, Theophilus, "speaking of those which are common to all priests, when they celebrate mass, there are six:—1. The Amice. 2. Albe. 3. Girdle. 4. Maniple.

5. Stole. 6. Chasuble, which is usually called the vestment, as being the chief and principal; and is also styled the priests' vestment, because none but priests use it. The *amice* is a piece of linen cloth with two strings. The priest puts it over his shoulders, on which account, St. Bonaventure, with the Greeks, call it *hummeale*, a covering for the shoulders: and is tied by the two strings, round the middle of the priest's body. Its name, *amice*, is from the Latin word *amictus*, or covered. Being clean and white, signifies, according to Rebanus, the purity and cleanness of heart with which the priest ought to go to the holy altar; and represents the linen with which the Jews blindfolded our Saviour, saying, in derision, "Prophesy unto us, O Christ! who it is that struck thee?" St. Luke, chap. xxiii.

"The *albe* is a long white linen garment, representing the white robe which, by Herod's command, was put upon our Saviour, in mockery and derision. It is called *albe*, from *alba*, which, in Latin, signifies white, or whiteness. Frequent mention is made, in the Old Testament, of white linen garments made for, and used by the Jewish priests. The use of the *albe* in the Christian church, is as ancient as the Apostles' times. St. Jerome affirms, that St. James used linen vestments, when he celebrated mass. The whiteness of the *albe* signifies continency and chastity; and is a memento, to put the priest in mind of the unspotted purity of life and manners he ought to be adorned with.

"The *girdle*, wove or made of linen thread, is to tie the *albe* about the priest's body, that it may hang with proper decency; and represents the cords with which our blessed Lord was bound, when seized on by the Jews; and may not unfitly signify the cords of love and duty with which all, especially priests, ought to be close bound to the service of God.

"The *maniple*, which the priest puts on his left arm, represents likewise the cords or binding of our blessed Lord. The priest, before he puts it on, kisses the cross which is in the middle of it, as offering himself to attend our Saviour in his passion, with a will and desire to suffer with him.

"The *stole*, from the Latin word *stola*, is an ornament of dignity and power; and, as such, it is taken, in the sacred text, wherein it is said, that when Pharaoh would honour Joseph, he put on him a stole; and Mordecai was clothed with a stole for his greater honour. The priest, when he exercises his functions, puts on a stole, as representing his dignity, quality, and the power of binding and loosing he hath received from Christ. It also signifies the cord wherewith the Jews dragged * our blessed Saviour to crucifixion.

* Christ was not *dragged*; he went voluntarily to suffering and death; but it seems as if it were not possible for Papists to give a just statement of any Scripture fact or doctrine.

“ The *chasuble* is the last vestment the priest uses, and is put over all the rest, hanging down before and behind. It represents the scarlet, or purple robe, put upon our Saviour by the soldiers, in scorn and derision. Before, it has a pillar, representing the pillar to which Christ was tied, during his flagellation. Behind, it has a cross, which signifies the cross which our blessed Lord carried to mount Calvary. This vestment is appropriated to priests alone, and is by them used only when they say mass. The amice, the alba, and maniple, being made use of by sub-deacons and deacons. These vestments, which the ministers of the altar are vested with, when they go to celebrate and offer up the adorable sacrifice, are deservedly very rich on great solemnities : but, at all times, ought to be whole, clean, and decent. The priest thus vested, and going to mass, represents the person of Jesus Christ going to his sacred passion. The consideration of which ought to fill both priest and people with sentiments of the profoundest respect and veneration towards the sacred mysteries which one is to celebrate, and the other attend to,” &c. &c.

If nobody else should thank me for this long extract, I am surely entitled to the gratitude of those citizens of Glasgow, and those strangers, who lounge away the Sabbath in the Popish chapel, in Clyde-street. I have often heard of such persons complaining that they could not understand the meaning of the various pieces of gorgeous finery, with which the priests decorate their great and *sacred* carcasses. I advise all, who shall hereafter attend mass, in said chapel, to buy this Number of THE PROTESTANT, and take it with them, as they do the play-bill, when they go to the theatre, that they may know the different pieces as they come to be represented.

The reverend Franciscan divine, from whose work I have quoted so largely, argues the propriety of using the above vestments, from the fact of similar ornaments having been divinely appointed to be worn by Aaron and his sons. “ God himself,” says he, “ commanded Moses to make various kinds of garments for Aaron, and the other inferior priests and Levites ; as the ephod, rationale, tunic, linen garments, girdle, and mitre. Those for the high-priest were to be exceeding rich and magnificent. If this was done in the old law, for the greater splendour of those legal sacrifices, wherein all those things were but types and figures, with how much more reason ought the priests of the new law to have vestments, or garments, suitable to their function and ministry, in offering up the true and real sacrifice ordained by Jesus Christ himself?”

The proper answer to this imposing question is that with which an apostle hath furnished us, that such things, being weak

and unprofitable, were abolished at the coming of Christ. They are, by this apostle, called weak and beggarly elements; he calls the persons foolish who sought to put themselves again under the bondage of such things; and, therefore, what sort of fools must they have been, in his esteem, who thought that the New Testament worship, in which the believer is invited to contemplate the fulfilment of legal types and shadows, should retain such shadows and types with an increase of splendour? Upon the same principle, the whole system of Judaism ought to be retained in the Christian church, and not only retained, but greatly augmented in the number and variety of rites and ceremonies. This, indeed, is what the Church of Rome professes to do; but, in doing so, she makes it manifest that she has departed from the simplicity and spirituality of evangelical worship.

The Mosaic dispensation exhibits the church of God in a state of nonage; as a son under tutors and governors, until the time appointed by the father. In this state, God thought proper to appoint certain carnal things, as the means of giving knowledge of spiritual things—to instruct the children of Israel in the spiritual and heavenly glory of Christ's priesthood, by the rich attire, the breastplate, the mitre, and the urim and thummim of the high priest; but these things could be of no use after Christ came, and had fulfilled all that was signified by them, and had given his disciples more perfect knowledge of himself directly, than they could possibly acquire through the medium of such shadows. To a child at school, the horn-book, or A, B, C, is a thing of great value; but of what use is it when the child has become a man, and a man of literature and science? According to the Popish mode of arguing, it would be of more importance than ever. If it was thought necessary to give the child a horn-book finely gilt, when he was a child, how much more now, when he has become a learned man, ought we not to give him a horn-book, adorned with gold and precious stones? This is precisely the argument which Papists use for imitating and exceeding the splendour of Jewish worship.

Before I leave Father Pacificus Baker, I must point out the gross imposition which he practises upon his readers, when he represents the apostle James, as having used linen vestments, when he celebrated mass. Whether St. Jerome said so, or not, is of no importance; for he lived so many ages after, that he could know nothing, with certainty, of the Apostle's practice, but what he found in the New Testament, that is, nothing more than we know; and we know for certain, that there is nothing of either the mass, or the white vestments, in the apostolic record. In another section, the author speaks of the liturgy

of St. James, which contains the order of the mass, and many other things which favour Popery ; but it is a barefaced forgery, the work of a later age, and known to be such by Popish writers themselves, though they do not scruple to take advantage of it, and things like it, when it serves the purpose of giving to the ignorant people the semblance of apostolical authority for their errors and superstitions. This, and other such pieces of imposition, may occupy a Number or two of my work, at a future period.

I proceed now to give my Protestant readers some farther information about things which they know not, though they are quite familiar to Papists. Let it be remembered, that a small piece of bread in the form of a wafer, is the real Christ of the Church of Rome ; this is their God and Saviour, and the object of their worship ; but they have never yet found out a way to preserve their Christ from seeing corruption. In summer, their host will corrupt, and breed worms in a few days ; and in order to prevent this, they consecrate every week, in the hot season ; but only once a fortnight in winter. After the host has begun to corrupt, even after it has begun to breed worms, the priest must eat it, if his stomach will let him ; but if he find it impossible to swallow the real body of his Christ, in this state, it is disposed of in the following solemn manner, of which Mr. Gavin was an eye-witness :—" I say," says he, " that a priest did not eat the host and worms, as I saw myself, on pretence of the loathing of his stomach, and after the mass was ended, he carried the host, two priests accompanying him with two candles, and threw it into a place called piscina, a place where they throw the dirty water after they wash their hands, and which runs out of the church into the street. What can we say now ? If the worms and corrupted host is the real body of Christ, see what a value they have for him, when they throw it away, like dirty water ; and if that host comes out of the running piscina into the street, the first dog or pig passing by, which is very common in Spain, may eat it." *Master Key*, vol. 1, p. 145.

In general, however, they are very careful to keep the host out of the reach of dogs ; and if it should, by accident, happen that a dog should eat a holy wafer, it is considered such a piece of sacrilege, that his owner must pay dearly for his trespass, of which take the following example from the work just quoted, page 147 :—

" In the Dominican's convent, it happened that a lady, who had a lap-dog, which she always carried along with her, went to receive the sacrament, with the dog under her arm, and the dog looking up and beginning to bark, when the friar went to put the wafer into the lady's mouth, he let the wafer fall, which happen-

ed to drop into the dog's mouth. Both the friar and the lady were in deep amazement, and confusion, and knew not what to do; so they sent for the reverend father Prior, who did resolve this nice point upon the spot, and ordered to call two friars and the clerk, and to bring the cross and two candlesticks, with candles lighted, and to carry the dog in form of procession into the vestry, and to keep the poor creature there, with illuminations, as if he was the host itself, till the digestion of the wafer was over, and then to kill the dog, and throw it into the piscina. Another friar said it was better to open the dog immediately, and take out the fragments of the host; and a third was of opinion that the dog should be burnt upon the spot. The lady, who loved dearly her Cupid (this was the dog's name) intreated the father Prior to save the dog's life, if possible, and she would give any thing to make amends for it. Then the Prior and friars retired to consult what to do in this case, and it was resolved that the dog should be called for the future, *El Perillo del Sacramento*, that is, the Sacrament's dog. 2. That if the dog should happen to die, the lady was to give him a burying in consecrated ground. 3. That the lady should take care not to let the dog play with other dogs. 4. That she was to give a silver dog, which was to be placed upon the tabernacle where the hosts are kept. And, 5. That she should give twenty pistoles to the convent. Every article was performed accordingly, and the dog was kept with a great deal of care and veneration. The case was printed, and so came to the ears of the Inquisitors, and Don Pedro Guerrero, first Inquisitor, thinking the thing very scandalous, sent for the poor dog, and kept him in the Inquisition, to the great grief of the lady. What became of the dog, nobody can tell."

I conclude this Number, and, I hope, this subject, with the following literal translation of a few passages of the "Roman Missal," as given by Lord Kames, in his "Sketches of the History of Man," vol. iv. book iii.:—

"Mass may be deficient in the matter, in the form, and in the minister. First, in the matter. If the bread be not of wheat, or if there be so great a mixture of other grain that it cannot be called wheat bread, or if any way corrupted, it does not make a sacrament. If it be made with rose-water, or any other distilled water, it is doubtful whether it makes a sacrament or not. Though corruption have begun, or though it be leavened, it makes a sacrament, but the celebrator sins grievously.

"If the celebrator, before consecration, observe that the host is corrupted, or is not of wheat, he must take another host; if after consecration, he must still take another and swallow it, after which, he must also swallow the first, or give it to another or preserve it with reverence."——

“ If any remains of meat, sticking in the mouth, be swallowed with the host, they do not prevent communicating, provided they be swallowed, not as meat, but as spittle. The same is to be said, if, in washing the mouth, a drop of water be swallowed, provided it be against our will.”——

“ If any requisite be wanting, it is no sacrament ; for example, if it be celebrated out of holy ground, or upon an altar not consecrated, or not covered with three napkins ; if there be no wax candles ; if it be not celebrated between day-break and noon ; if the celebrator have not said matins with lauds ; or if he omit any of the sacerdotal robes ; if these robes and the napkins be not blessed by a bishop ; if there be no clerk present to serve, or one who ought not to serve,—a woman, for example ; if there be no chalice, the cup of which is gold, or silver, or pewter ; if the vestment be not of clean linen, adorned with silk in the middle, and blessed by a bishop ; if the priest celebrate with his head covered ; if there be no missal present, though he have it by heart.

“ If a gnat or spider fall into the cup, after consecration, the priest must swallow it with the blood, if he can ; otherwise, let him take it out, wash it with wine, burn it, and throw it with the washings on holy ground. If poison fall into the cup, the blood must be poured on tow or on a linen cloth, remain till it be dry, then be burnt, and the ashes be thrown upon holy ground. If the host be poisoned, it must be kept in a tabernacle till it be corrupted.

“ If the blood freeze in winter, put warm cloths about the cup : if that be not sufficient, put the cup in boiling water. If any of Christ’s blood fall upon the ground by negligence, it must be licked up with the tongue, and the place scraped ; the scrapings must be burnt, and the ashes buried in holy ground.

“ If the priest vomit the eucharist, and the species appear entire, it must be licked up most reverently. If a nausea prevent that to be done, it must be kept till it be corrupted. If the species do not appear entire, let the vomit be burnt, and the ashes thrown upon holy ground.”

It will be expected, perhaps, that I should give a more elegant finishing to a subject that has served me so long ; but, as transubstantiation and the mass are abomination all over, I shall leave the above disgusting directions, without comment, to have their own effect upon the reader’s mind ; and it will be well for him if nothing but his mind be affected by the nausea.

THE

Protestant,

No. LXVIII.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 50th, 1819.

I HAVE discussed, at great length, the idolatry of the church of Rome, as it consists in worshipping saints, images, and relics, and particularly the consecrated wafer, which, she says, is really her Christ and Saviour, and which she worships under this character. I come now to show the conformity of Romish idolatry with that of the heathens of ancient Rome, and other heathens, whose rites were adopted by what has falsely been called Christian Rome, and which, at this day, constitute the leading parts of Popish worship, and are that by which the Church of Rome is chiefly distinguished from other churches, at least so far as relates to external rites and ceremonies.

Three centuries had not elapsed, when the church in Rome, whose faith, in the Apostles' days, was spoken of throughout the whole world, had become so deplorably degenerate, that she readily received into her bosom persons who had no faith at all; mere worldly men, who were heathens both in principle and practice, and who were quite incapable of making a common cause with the disciples of Christ, or maintaining the purity of Christian worship. Such persons, instead of seeking to promote the glory of Christ, and the salvation of men, would follow the natural bias of their own minds. Christianity was, by this time, rising into some degree of respectability in the world. There were many great men who professed to be Christians; and there were many, no doubt, ready to join them, if they could but satisfy themselves that, by doing so, they would promote their interest. When Constantine, called the Great, took Christianity under his protection, and gave it a legal establishment, it became

very evident that the way to rise in the world, was to be of the Emperor's religion. Thus many made a profession of Christianity who were really heathens, and whose influence, after being admitted into the church, was exerted to reduce Christian worship to a conformity with that of the heathen temple.

The spirit of proselytism still continued ; but it was no longer a desire to win souls to the Saviour ; but merely to gain men to the church ; and if they were great men, and noble princes, the leading men in the church were ready to concede almost any thing for the sake of securing them. It was no longer necessary that men should deny themselves, and take up the cross, and become followers of Christ, in lowliness of mind, deadness to the world, and liveliness towards God and spiritual things. It was enough that they submitted to baptism, that they took the name of Christian, and that they paid due respect to the image of the cross. They retained all their heathenish notions and affections ; and to keep them quiet in their Christian profession, it became necessary to indulge them in their heathen practices and modes of worship. The Church, by degrees, became full of such members ; and her worship became that which is practised in the Church of Rome to this day,—no better than the profane mumery of heathen superstition.

I shall proceed to prove this by a number of instances, furnished by one who was an eye witness of the different parts of Romish worship, as practised in Rome itself ; and whose extensive and intimate acquaintance with the writings and practices of ancient heathens, qualified him, in an eminent degree, for tracing the Romish rites to their heathen original. I refer to Dr Middleton, whose " Letter from Rome" supplies abundant materials for this part of my subject. The remaining part of this Number shall be occupied by extracts from this letter. I do not believe the work is much known among the readers of my Papers, and therefore I make no apology for treating them with so much matter that is not original. I am following the example of a writer in THE TIMES newspaper, under the signature of IGNOTUS, who, about two years ago, published a number of letters in that paper, and afterwards in the form of a three shilling pamphlet, of which Middleton's Letter is confessedly the basis :—

" Many of our divines have, I know, with much learning and solid reasoning, charged, and effectually proved, the crime of idolatry on the Church of Rome : but these controversies (in which there is still something plausible to be said on the other side, and where the charge is constantly denied, and with much subtlety evaded) are not capable of giving that conviction, which I immediately received from my senses—the surest witnesses of fact, in all cases ; and which no man can fail to be furnished with,

who sees Popery, as it is exercised in Italy, in the full pomp and display of its pageantry; and practising all its arts and powers without caution or reserve. The similitude of the Popish and Pagan religion seemed so evident and clear, and struck my imagination so forcibly, that I soon resolved to give myself the trouble of searching to the bottom; and to explain and demonstrate the certainty of it, by comparing together the principal and most obvious parts of each worship: which, as it was my first employment after I came to Rome, shall be the subject of my first Letter."——

"The very first thing that a stranger must necessarily take notice of, as soon as he enters their churches, is the use of incense or perfumes in their religious offices: the first step which he takes within the door, will be sure to make him sensible of it, by the offence that he will immediately receive from the smell, as well as smoke of this incense, with which the whole church continues filled for some time after every solemn service. A custom received directly from paganism; and which presently called to my mind the old descriptions of the heathen temples and altars, which are seldom or ever mentioned by the ancients, without the epithet of perfumed or incensed." *pages 132—134, 4th ed.* I forbear giving the authorities, and the Greek and Latin quotations, which the author gives in the margin. Readers who wish to see these, will have recourse to the work itself.

"In some of their principal churches, where you have before you, in one view, a great number of altars, and all of them smoking at once with steams of incense, how natural is it to suppose one's self transported into the temple of some heathen deity, or that of the Paphian Venus, described by Virgil?

"Her hundred altars there with garlands crown'd,
And richest incense smoking, breathe around
Sweet odours," &c.

"Under the pagan Emperors, the use of incense, for any purpose of religion, was thought so contrary to the obligations of Christianity, that, in their persecutions, the very method of trying and convicting a Christian, was by requiring him only to throw the least grain of it into the censer, or upon the altar," *page 135.* This was, it seems, the test of a man's being, or not being, a Christian. How few Protestants, in the present day, would bear the test? To throw the smallest grain of incense, that is, to give the smallest possible degree of countenance to idolatrous worship, was equivalent to a renouncing of Christianity: yet, how many of our citizens are there, who reckon themselves very good Christians, and who can, without scruple,

voluntarily join in the service of the idol's temple, in Clyde-street, and snuff up, with the utmost complacency, the fumes of incense which are offered to the Popish idol?

Our author proceeds:—"Under the Christian Emperors, on the other hand, it was looked upon as a rite so peculiarly heathenish, that the very places or houses, where it could be proved to have been done, (*i. e.* where incense had been offered,) were, by the law of Theodosius, confiscated to the government.

"In the old bas-reliefs, or pieces of sculpture, where any heathen sacrifice is represented, we never fail to observe a boy in a sacred habit, which was always white, attending on the priest, with a little chest, or box, in his hands, in which this incense was kept for the use of the altar. And, in the same manner still in the Church of Rome, there is always a boy in surplice, waiting on the priest at the altar, with the sacred utensils, and among the rest the thuribulum, or vessel of incense, which the priest, with many ridiculous motions and crossings, waves several times, as it is smoking, around and over the altar in different parts of the service." *page 136.*

Dr. Middleton's Letter, when it was first published, excited almost as much rage and wrath among the Papists of his day, against the unhappy author, as are excited, at this day, against THE PROTESTANT. The author of a work, entitled "The Catholic Christian instructed," thought himself called upon to write something, that should pass with his brethren for a Reply to the obnoxious Letter; but after a great deal of quibbling and vapouring, he left the Letter just as he found it, without invalidating any material fact contained in it. This writer attempts to vindicate his church from the charge of conformity with heathenism in the matter of offering incense, because this was used, according to divine appointment, in the service of the temple of God under the Mosaic dispensation: to which Middleton replies, in a preface to his fourth edition:—"Should we grant him all he can infer from this argument, what will he gain by it? Were not all those beggarly elements wiped away by the spiritual worship of the gospel? Were they not all annulled on account of their weakness and unprofitableness, by the more perfect revelation of Jesus Christ? If then, I should acknowledge my mistake, and recall my words; and, instead of Pagan, call them Jewish ceremonies; would not the use of Jewish rites be abominable still in a Christian church, where they are expressly abolished and prohibited by God himself?"—"He tells us, that there was an altar of incense in the temple of Jerusalem; and is surprised, therefore, how I can call it heathenish: yet, it is evident, from the nature of that institution, that it was never designed to be perpetual; and that, during its continuance, God

would never have approved any other altar, either in Jerusalem or any where else. But, let him answer directly to this plain question ; was there ever a temple in the world, not strictly heathenish, in which there were several altars, all smoking with incense, within one view, and at one and the same time ? It is certain, that he must answer in the negative : yet, it is certain, that there were many such temples in Pagan Rome ; and are *as many* still in Christian Rome ; and since there never was an example of it but what was heathenish, before the times of Popery, how is it possible that it could be derived to them from any other source ? Or, when we see such an exact resemblance in the copy, how can there be any doubt about the original ?”

“ The next thing that will, of course, strike one’s imagination, is their use of holy water ; for nobody ever goes in or out of a church, but is either sprinkled by the priest, who attends for that purpose on solemn days, or else serves himself with it from a vessel, usually of marble, placed just at the door, not unlike one of our baptismal fountains. Now, this ceremony is so notoriously and directly transmitted to them from paganism, that their own writers make not the least scruple to own it. The Jesuit, La Cerda, in his notes on a passage of Virgil, where this practice is mentioned, says, ‘ Hence was derived the custom of holy church, to provide purifying or holy water at the entrance of their churches.’ ‘ *Aquaminarium* or *Amula*,’ says the learned Montfaucon, ‘ was a vase of holy water, placed by the heathens at the entrance of their temples, to sprinkle themselves with.’ The same vessel was by the Greeks called *Περίσσαντήριον* ; two of which, the one of gold, the other of silver, were given by Cræsus to the temple of Apollo, at Delphi ; and the custom of sprinkling themselves was so necessary a part of their religious offices, that the method of excommunication seems to have been by prohibiting to offenders the approach and use of the holy water-pot. The very composition of this holy water was the same also among the heathens as it is now among the Papists, being nothing more than a mixture of salt with common water ; and the form of the sprinkling brush, called by the ancients *aspersorium*, or *aspergillum*, (which is now the same with what the priests make use of,) may be seen in bas-reliefs, or ancient coins, wherever the insignia, or emblems of the Pagan priesthood are described, of which it is generally one.

“ Platina, in his lives of the Popes, and other authors, ascribe the institution of this holy water to Pope Alexander the first, who is said to have lived about the year of Christ, 113 ; but it could not be introduced so early, since, for some ages after, we find the primitive fathers speaking of it as a custom purely

heathenish, and condemning it as impious and detestable. Justin Martyr says, that it was invented by demons, in imitation of the true baptism signified by the Prophets, that their votaries might also have their pretended purification by water : and the Emperor Julian, out of spite to the Christians, used to order the victuals in the markets to be sprinkled with holy water, on purpose either to starve or force them to eat, what, by their own principles, they esteemed polluted.

“ Thus we see what contrary notions the primitive and Romish church have of this ceremony : the first condemns it as superstitious, abominable, and irreconcilable with Christianity : the latter adopts it as highly edifying and applicable to the improvement of Christian piety. The one looks upon it as the contrivance of the devil to delude mankind ; the other as the security of mankind against the delusions of the devil. But what is still more ridiculous than even the ceremony itself, is to see their learned writers gravely reckoning up the several virtues and benefits, derived from the use of it, both to the soul and the body ; and to crown all, producing a long roll of miracles, to attest the certainty of each virtue which they ascribe to it.” *p.* 136 —140.

“ I do not at present recollect whether the ancients went so far, as to apply the use of this holy water to the purifying or blessing of their horses, asses, and other cattle ; or whether this be an improvement of modern Rome, which has dedicated a yearly festival peculiarly to this service, called, in their vulgar language, the benediction of horses ; which is always celebrated with much solemnity in the month of January ; when all the inhabitants of the city and neighbourhood send up their horses, asses, &c. to the convent of St. Antony, near St. Mary’s the Great, where a priest in surplice, at the church door, sprinkles with his brush all the animals singly, as they are presented to him, and receives from each owner a gratuity proportionable to his zeal and ability. Amongst the rest, I had my own horses blessed at the expense of about eighteen pence of our money ; as well to satisfy my own curiosity, as to humour the coachman ; who was persuaded, as the common people generally are, that some mischance would befall them within the year, if they wanted the benefit of this benediction.”

“ I have met, indeed, with some hints of a practice not foreign to this among the ancients, of sprinkling their horses with water in the Circensian games ; but whether this was done out of a superstitious view of inspiring any virtue, or purifying them for those races, which were esteemed sacred, or merely to refresh them under the violence of such an exercise, is not easy to determine. But allowing the Romish Priests to have taken the hint

from some old custom of Paganism ; yet this, however, must be granted them, that they alone were capable of cultivating so coarse and barren a piece of superstition, into a revenue sufficient for the maintenance of forty or fifty idle monks." *p.* 141, 142.

Middleton afterwards acquired more information, with regard to the origin of this rite ; for he writes as follows, in the preface to his fourth edition, in reply to his opponent :—

" But though our Catholic seems so much ashamed at present of this benediction of horses in their church, I can give him such light into the origin of it, as will make him proud of it, probably, for the future, from a story which I have observed in St. Jerome, which shows it to be grounded on a miracle, and derived from a saint : I mean St. Hilarion, the founder of the monastic orders in Syria and Palestine. The story is this : ' A citizen of Gaza, a Christian, who kept a stable of running horses for the Circensian games, was always beaten by his antagonist, an idolater, the master of the rival stable. For the idolater, by the help of certain charms, and diabolical imprecations, constantly damped the spirits of the Christian's horses, and added courage to his own. The Christian, therefore, in despair, applied himself to St. Hilarion, and implored his assistance ; but the saint was unwilling to enter into an affair so frivolous and profane ; till the Christian urged it as a necessary defence against these adversaries of God, whose insults were levelled not so much at him, as at the church of Christ. And his entreaties being seconded by the monks who were present ; the saint ordered his earthen jug, out of which he used to drink, to be filled with water and delivered to the man ; who presently sprinkled his stable, his horses, his charioteers, his chariot, and the very boundaries of the course with it. Upon this the whole city was in wondrous expectation. The idolaters derided what the Christian was doing, while the Christians took courage, and assured themselves of victory ; till the signal being given for the race, the Christian's horses seemed to fly, whilst the idolater's were labouring behind and left quite out of sight ! so that the Pagans themselves were obliged to cry out, that their god Marnas was conquered at last by Christ.' *Pref. p.* xvii.

" No sooner is a man advanced a little forward into their churches, and begins to look about him, but he will find his eyes and attention attracted by a number of lamps and wax candles, which are constantly burning before the shrines and images of their saints. In all the great churches in Italy, says Mabillon they hang up lamps at every altar : a sight which will not only surprise a stranger by the novelty of it, but will furnish him with

another proof and example of the conformity of the Roman with the Pagan worship ; by recalling to his memory many passages of the heathen writers, where their perpetual lamps and candles are described, as continually burning before the altars and statues of their Deities.”—“ The primitive writers frequently expose the folly and absurdity of this heathenish custom. ‘ They light up candles to God,’ says Lactantius, ‘ as if he lived in the dark : and do not they deserve to pass for madmen, who offer lamps to the Author and Giver of light ?’

“ In the collection of old inscriptions, we find many instances of presents and donations from private persons, of lamps and candlesticks to the temples and altars of their gods : a piece of zeal which continues still in modern Rome ; where each church abounds in lamps of massy silver, and sometimes even of gold ; the gifts of princes, and other persons of distinction : and it is surprising to see how great a number of this kind are perpetually burning before the altars of their principal saints, or miraculous images ; as St. Antony of Padua, or the Lady of Loretto ; as well as the vast profusion of wax candles with which the churches are illuminated on every great festival ; when the high altar, covered with gold and silver plate, brought out of their treasures, and stuck full of wax lights, disposed in beautiful figures, looks more like the rich side-board of some great prince, dressed out for a feast, than an altar to pay divine worship at.” *p. 141---145.*

“ The mention of Loretto puts me in mind of the surprise that I was in, at the first sight of the holy image ; for its face is as black as a negro’s ; so that one would take it rather for the representation of a Proserpine, or infernal deity, than that which they impiously style it, of the Queen of heaven. But I soon recollected, that this very circumstance of its complexion, did but resemble the more exactly the old idols of Paganism, which, in sacred as well as profane writers, are described to be black with the perpetual smoke of lamps and incense.

“ When a man is once engaged in reflections of this kind, imagining himself in some heathen temple, and expecting as it were some sacrifice, or other piece of Paganism, to ensue, he will not be long in suspense, before he sees the finishing acts and last scene of idolatry, in crowds of bigot votaries prostrating themselves before some image of wood or stone, and paying divine honours to an idol of their own erecting. Should they squabble with us here about the meaning of the word idol, St. Jerome has determined it to the very case in question, telling us, that by idols are to be understood the images of the dead : and the worshippers of such images are used always in the style of the fathers, as terms synonymous and equivalent to heathens and Pagans.” *p. 156*

THE
Protestant,

No. LXIX.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 6th, 1819.

GREGORY the Great is allowed to have been one of the best of the Popes; yet, he had no objection to mix up a little heathenism with his Christianity. "Witness," says Dr. Campbell, in his Lectures on Ecclesiastical History, vol. ii. p. 74. "the advice which he gave to the monk Augustine, who had been sent into Britain for the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons, not to abolish their paganish ceremonies, but rather adopt them, and give them a new direction, that so the conversion of the people might be facilitated, and their relapse to the superstition of their fathers prevented." This took place as early as the latter part of the sixth century;* and there can be no doubt, that what was called Christianity in Italy, had, by this time, gone great lengths in conformity with heathenism, when the head of the church could, without shame, give such instructions to one of his missionaries in a distant part of the world. Conversion had now become a very different thing from what it was in the days of the Apostles. It was then a turning from idols to serve the living God; it was now a turning from God to the service of idols; for the Romish Christians, instead of converting heathens to the faith of Christ, were, by the seducing influence of the latter, turned from the faith, and converted to heathenism; if that can be

* Christianity had been planted in Britain several ages before this, and when the Bishop of Rome was no greater than another bishop; but the Christians had been driven by the new comers to take shelter among the mountains of Wales, where their descendants continue to this day.

called conversion which accords with the natural depravity of the human heart. In point of fact, idolatry is as palpable in Rome at this day, as it was in the days of Nero; for the Pantheon which had been dedicated to Jove, and all the gods, was, by Pope Boniface IV. consecrated to the Virgin Mary, and all the saints. With this single alteration, it serves as exactly for all the purposes of Popish, as it did for the pagan worship: of which see a more particular account in my forty-third Number, vol. i. p. 340.

Middleton shows the exact conformity between Popery and paganism, in a number of particulars, which it is not my intention to quote at length, though I intend to give some more of the most prominent. My object is to show that the great leading features of the two systems are the same, and that the one was evidently derived from the other. Pope Gregory the Great, who gave the above instructions to the monk Augustine, for the conversion of the Anglo-Saxons, plainly confessed that images and pictures were set up in churches for the sake of the pagans; that those who did not know, and could not read the Scriptures, might learn from the images what they ought to worship. (See Middleton, p. 243.) The images and pictures were not, at first, professedly objects of worship; but, with the increasing darkness and growing ignorance of persons called Christians, they soon came to be so. The first admission of such things as helps to devotion, was an open departure from the simplicity of spiritual worship; and it prepared the way for all the idol worship that followed. Doubtless there were many in the apostolic churches who could not read, who were yet taught to worship God in spirit and in truth, without the aid of pictures and images. In fact, there are no images that can represent those things, by the knowledge and belief of which sinners are saved, and taught to offer to God acceptable worship. It is life eternal to know the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom he hath sent. That is, to know and acknowledge God in those characters of justice and mercy, by which he makes himself known in the gospel of his Son. Here he is revealed as the just God and the Saviour; as a Being of such holiness and purity, that he cannot look upon sin; and yet so rich in mercy, as to devise a way for the salvation of sinners, consistently with these characters of holiness and justice. It is by the knowledge of this, as revealed to us in the Scriptures, that sinners are saved; and this is the foundation of all Christian worship. But these things cannot possibly be represented by material images or pictures. What figure would any man use to represent the love of God the Father? Is it possible to paint on canvass, or cut in marble, a resemblance of infinite holiness and justice? Is it possible to represent by sculpture, or painting, the

anguish of mind which Christ suffered on account of sin, when his soul was exceeding sorrowful, even unto death? It certainly is not possible to make images of such things. No man could think of it, unless his mind were diverted from the God who is a Spirit, and directed to a creature of his own fancy, to which he wishes to give that honour which is due to God alone. Hence it is, that it was so peremptorily forbidden to worship God by means of any figure of any thing in the heavens, or in the earth; for this could not be thought of, without the alienation of the mind from the knowledge of the true God.

The image of the cross, indeed, is thought to represent the sufferings of Christ on account of sin; and this, I suppose, was one of the first images that was set up in any Christian church. But, in fact, it represents no such thing; and it can be of no more use in Christian worship, than the image of Jupiter, or any piece of heathen sculpture. Death, by crucifixion, was a common punishment among the Romans; and the figure of a cross, with the figure of a man extended upon it, can give no more idea of the sufferings of Christ, than of the sufferings of any other man, put to death in the same way. It may tend to preserve the remembrance of the fact, that Christ was crucified, and so it may perpetuate the name of Christian, where there is nothing of real Christianity: but the knowledge of the fact is of no value without the knowledge of its meaning, and the knowledge that the principal part of Christ's sufferings were not those of his body upon the cross, but those of his soul, when God exacted of him the penalty of the transgressions of all his people. This cannot possibly be represented by an image; and the very attempt to represent the sufferings of Christ in such a way, shows that the person who does so, has false and degrading notions of the death of Christ,—such as, in fact, show that he is no Christian; and the devotion of such a man, however ardent it may be, is nothing but devotion to an idol which he has set up in his own mind.

It is pleaded by Popish writers, that the image of the cross is calculated to excite devotion and gratitude to Him who died upon it; but if the image could effect this, surely the reality would have been much more likely to do so. If a wooden cross, and a wooden image upon it, be so effectual in producing sentiments of piety and devotion, it might have been supposed, that when Christ himself hung upon the cross, in the view of all Jerusalem, many thousands would have been moved to devotion by the sight; but we know that such was not the case. The multitude were moved by no feeling more amiable than rage, and hatred of him whom they had crucified; and we know that, in subsequent ages, men calling themselves Christians, have exhibited the same hatred and rage against Christ and his cause, when

they put thousands to death, and that too, under the banner of the cross, for no greater crime than confessing his truth according to his word. In short, the cross is one of the great bloody idols of the Church of Rome; and has occasioned, I suppose, a greater waste of human life than any one idol known in the heathen world.

But, to return to the conformity between Popish and pagan worship, there is in Rome, at this day, a practice of presenting children before the image of a saint, which has evidently been borrowed from a fable respecting Romulus, the founder of the city:—"From the tradition," says Dr. Middleton, "of the wonderful escape which Romulus had in this very place, when exposed, in his infancy, to perish in the Tiber; as soon as he came to be a god, he was looked upon as singularly propitious to the health and safety of young children; from which notion, it became a practice for nurses and mothers to present their sickly infants before his shrine in this temple, in confidence of a cure or relief by his favour. Now, when this temple was converted afterwards into a Christian church, lest any piece of superstition should be lost, or the people think themselves sufferers by the change, in losing the benefit of such a protection for their children, care was taken to find out, in the place of the heathen god, a Christian saint, who had been exposed too in his infancy, and found by chance, like Romulus, and for the same reason, might be presumed to be just as fond of children, as their old deity had been: and thus, the worship paid to Romulus being now transferred to Theodorus, the old superstition still subsists, and the custom of presenting children at this shrine continues to this day, without intermission; of which I, myself, have been a witness; having seen, as oft as I looked into this church, ten or a dozen women decently dressed, each with a child in her lap, sitting with silent reverence before the altar of the saint, in expectation of his miraculous influence on the health of the infant.

"In consecrating these heathen temples to the Popish worship, that the change might be less offensive, and the old superstition as little shocked as possible, they generally observe some resemblance of character and quality in the saint, whom they substitute to the old deity: 'If, in converting the profane worship of the Gentiles,' says the describer of modern Rome, 'to the pure and sacred worship of the church, the faithful use to follow some rule and proportion, they have certainly hit upon it here, in dedicating to the Madonna, or holy Virgin, the temple formerly sacred to the Bona Dea, or good goddess.' But they have more frequently, on these occasions, had regard rather to a similitude of name between the old and new idol. Thus, in a place formerly sacred to Apollo, there now stands the church of Apollinaris; built

there, as they tell us, that the profane name of that deity might be converted into the glorious name of this martyr; and, where there anciently stood a temple of Mars, they have erected a church to *Martina*, with this inscription:

‘ Mars hence expell’d, *Martina*, martyr’d maid,
Claims now the worship which to him was paid.’

“ Whatever worship was paid by the ancients, to their heroes or inferior deities, the Romans now pay the same to their saints and martyrs, as their own inscriptions plainly declare; which, like those mentioned above of *St. Martina*, and the *Pantheon*, generally signify that the honours, which of old had been impiously given in that place, to the false god, are now piously and rightly transferred to the Christian saint: or, as one of their celebrated poets expresses himself in regard to *St. George*.

‘ As Mars our fathers once ador’d, so now
To thee, O *George*, we humbly prostrate bow.’

Pages 167, 168, 177.

“ But what gave me a still greater notion of the superstition of these countries, was to see those little oratories, or rural shrines, sometimes placed under the cover of a tree or grove, agreeably to the descriptions of the old idolatry, the sacred as well as profane writers; or, more generally, raised on some eminence; or, in the phrase of Scripture, on high places, the constant scenes of idolatrous worship in all ages; it being an universal opinion among the heathens, that the gods, in a peculiar manner, loved to reside on eminences or tops of mountains; which pagan notion prevails still so generally with the Papists, that there is hardly a rock or precipice, how dreadful or difficult soever of access, that has not an oratory, or altar, or crucifix at least, planted upon it.”
Page 184.

“ When we enter their towns, the case is still the same as it was in the country; we find every where the same marks of idolatry, and the same reasons to make us fancy that we are still treading pagan ground; whilst, at every corner, we see images and altars, with lamps or candles burning before them; exactly answering to the descriptions of the ancient writers; and to what *Tertullian* reproaches the heathen with, that their streets, their markets, their baths, were not without an idol. But, above all, in the pomp and solemnity of their holy-days, and especially their religious processions, we see the genuine remains of heathenism, and proof enough to convince us that this is still the same Rome which old *Numa* first tamed and civilized by the arts of religion:

who, as Plutarch says, by the institution of supplications and processions to the gods, which inspire reverence, whilst they give pleasure to the spectators, and by pretended miracles, and divine apparitions, reduced the fierce spirits of his subjects under the power of superstition." *Page 187.*

"The descriptions of the religious pomps and processions of the heathens come so near to what we see on every festival of the virgin, or other Romish saint, that one can hardly help thinking these Popish ones to be still regulated by the old ceremonial of Pagan Rome. At these solemnities, the chief magistrate used frequently to assist, in robes of ceremony, attended by the priests in surplices, with wax candles in their hands, carrying upon a pageant, or thensa, the images of their gods dressed out in their best clothes: these were usually followed by the principal youth of the place, in white linen vestments or surplices, singing hymns in honour of the god whose festival they were celebrating, accompanied by crowds of all sorts, that were initiated in the same religion, all with flambeaux or wax candles in their hands. This is the account which Apuleius, and other authors, give of a heathen procession; and I may appeal to all who have been abroad, whether it might not pass quite as well for the description of a Popish one. Monsieur Tournefort, in his travels through Greece, reflects upon the Greek church, for having retained, and taken into their present worship, many of the old rites of heathenism; and particularly that of carrying and dancing about the images of the saints in their processions, to singing and music. The reflection is full as applicable to his own as to the Greek church; and the practice itself, so far from giving scandal in Italy, that the learned publisher of the Florentine Inscriptions takes occasion to show the conformity between them and the heathens, from this very instance of carrying about the pictures of their saints, as the pagans did those of their gods, in their sacred processions.

"In one of these processions, made lately to St. Peter's, in the time of lent, I saw that ridiculous penance of the flagellantes, or self-whippers, who march with whips in their hands, and lash themselves as they go along, on the bare back, till it is all covered with blood; in the same manner as the fanatical priests of Bel-lona, or the Syrian goddess, as well as the votaries of Isis, used to slash and cut themselves of old, in order to please the goddess, by the sacrifice of their own blood; which mad piece of discipline, we find frequently mentioned and as oft ridiculed by the ancient writers.

"But they have another exercise of the same kind, and in the same season of Lent, which, under the notion of penance, is still a more absurd mockery of all religion: when, on a certain day, appointed annually for this discipline, men of all conditions assemble

themselves, towards the evening, in one of the churches of the city ; where whips or lashes, made of cords, are provided, and distributed to every person present ; and after they are all served, and a short office of devotion performed, the candles being put out, upon the warning of a little bell, the whole company begin presently to strip, and try the force of their whips on their own backs : during all which time, the church becomes, as it were, the proper image of hell, where nothing is heard but the noise of lashes and chains, mixed with the groans of these self-tormentors ; till satiated with their exercise, they are content to put on their clothes ; and the candles being lighted again, upon the tinkling of a second bell, they all appear in their proper dress.

“ Seneca, alluding to the very same effects of fanaticism in Pagan Rome, says, ‘ So great is the force of it on disordered minds, that they try to appease the gods, by such methods as an enraged man would hardly think of to revenge himself. But, if there be any gods who desire to be worshipped after this manner, they do not deserve to be worshipped at all, since the very worst of tyrants, though they have sometimes torn and tortured people’s limbs, yet have never commanded men to torture themselves.’ But, there is no occasion to imagine, that all the blood which seems to flow on these occasions, really comes from the backs of these bigots ; for, it is probable, that, like their frantic predecessors, they may use some craft, as well as zeal, in this their fury ; and, I cannot but think there was a great deal of justice in that edict of the Emperor Commodus, with regard to these *Belonarii*, or whippers of antiquity, though it is usually imputed to his cruelty, when he commanded that they should not be suffered to impose upon the spectators, but be obliged to cut and slash themselves in good earnest.” *pp.* 188—193.

I would gladly give more extracts from this interesting work ; indeed it would be doing a service to the public to reprint the whole ; but this is the less necessary, as the *Letters of Ignoribus*, to which I referred in my last Number, contain the greater part of it, with a confirmation of some material facts from other authors. In particular, he has shown the exact conformity of the water idolatry of our Papists in Ireland with that of the Hindoos, from Mr. Grant’s *Observations on India*, ordered by the House of Commons to be printed, 15th June, 1813. “ Of holy rivers,” says Mr. Grant, “ dedicated to one or other of the deities, Brahma, Vishnow, or Mahades, there are twenty-eight, named in the Institutes of the Emperor Akber, beginning with the Ganges, and traversing the whole continent, to the Indies ; so that all the professors of Hinduism are within reach of an antidote against the consequences of guilt.” “ The virtues of the river Ganges are universally allowed to be pre-eminent ;—the water of it assuredly

purifies from all sin : ablutions in it are used continually to this end, as Europeans daily see : and the dying, when within a moderate distance of it, are carried to its edge, and their feet are placed in the river, that thus they may have a happy passage out of life. Its water is conveyed to distant parts for the same purpose ; and, if persons are not within reach of it—thinking of it, and invoking it, when they bathe in any other water, will still give them all the efficacy of it.”

“ Now,” says *IGNOTUS*, *p.* 60, “ the analogy between the practices of heathen Rome and India, and the practices of the Church of Rome and her priests in Ireland, although forming a part of our Protestant empire, and lying immediately under our own eyes, is very remarkable. A main part of the worship of Irish Roman Catholics, is made by their priests to consist in this water idolatry. St. Patrick’s purgatory is an island situate in the midst of a lake in the County of Donegal, called Lochderg, or the Red Lake, reputed to be sacred ; and, to this place, immense shoals of misguided Papists are sent by their spiritual guides to wash away their sins, precisely as is done in India, under the tuition of the heathen priests.” The author then gives a long account of the ceremonies practised at this holy lake ; but they are so similar in extravagance, impiety, and folly, to what I gave in my fifty-fourth Number, that I need not repeat them.

I conclude this subject with the remark, that it would be unreasonable to expect to find any thing better than idolatry in Popish worship. Popery, as I have said in some of my papers, is the religion of corrupt human nature. Every man by nature is an idolater ; that is, he places his chief delight, and pays his chief respect ; nay, he pays the whole devotion of his heart to something else than the true God. Real Christianity produces such a change in the heart and character of men, that they are led to renounce dependence on every thing else, and to devote themselves entirely to the service of God. This change is nothing less than being created anew by the power of the holy Spirit. It is what Christ himself calls being born again : and without this, there is no real Christianity. But, in Popery, there is no new creation—no change greater than that which a priest can effect by the act of baptism. To speak of the necessity of any other change, would be no less than heresy ; and, those who are deluded by this, and other errors of Popery, must continue idolaters in one form or another

THE
Protestant,

No. LXX.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 13th, 1819.

HAVING been occupied for about six months in exposing the idolatry of the Church of Rome, it is now time to proceed to something else. I propose to myself a serious investigation of some other Popish errors, such as are taught concerning Purgatory and prayers for the dead; but before entering upon such grave subjects, I shall treat my readers with a number or two of lighter matter, and a specimen of my correspondence.

Though I have received almost a chestful of letters on the subjects of my work, I have had only one from a professed Papist, besides the two from Mr. Scott, printed in my 8th, and the short note from Mr. Simeon in my 50th Number. I have, indeed, had one also from a Papist in disguise; or, perhaps a weak-minded Protestant, who misnames himself "liberal minded," who has descended to act a Popish and Jesuitical part, in a silly attempt to defend Mr. M'Hardy: but there is only one avowed Papist who has condescended to address me, with remarks upon my publication, and a defence of his Church. As he writes with pretty good temper, and some degree of modesty; and as I believe he expresses the sentiments of the more sensible Papists in this country, I shall give his letter entire, and follow it with a few remarks:—

Edinburgh, 14th August, 1819.

"SIR,

"I take the liberty of writing you concerning the charge you have made and promised, "*Deo volente*," to pursue against the system of Popery and its adherents; I never intended to write a word on the subject, (though it merits attention if properly handled) until I read in your fifty-first Number, your intention of treating on the errors of Popery; which, according to

your belief, are not few. Among the first and greatest are, "idolatry of the mass, purgatory, prayers for the dead, auricular confession, clerical celibacy, extreme unction, cruelty of the Jesuits," &c. &c. : and a good many more supposed errors, which it is not necessary for me to mention here. The only point I intend to speak of is idolatry, which is the most infamous charge against the Church of Rome, notwithstanding every one of her children has as much hatred against idolatry as any man in the world, or even the purest puritan in the city of Glasgow. If our Saviour's prophecy was to be fulfilled, "that the gates of hell would never prevail against that church which he purchased with his blood," this promise, in my opinion, shakes the foundation of the Reformation, and every branch that has sprung from it. I would wish very much to be informed when the supposed errors of Popery came to be fashionable, without any records of them. There is no heresy whatever, nor any point of discipline, that is, or ever was practised in the Church of Rome, or any other church whatever, but what is recorded by some historian: but we have no such records of the supposed errors of the Catholic church; surely, then, they have dropped from the clouds, and got full possession of the universal church without being perceived by any body, till the clear sighted Martin Luther made the happy discovery; for, truly, I can think of no other way to render it possible that it should get admittance all at once, without any opposition whatever. This, however, being somewhat out of the way, and proper only for machinery exploits upon the theatre, we must rather suppose Protestants will say it came in by degrees; be it so, but then it is reasonable they should give us a satisfactory answer to a few questions, and prove the truth of the facts from unquestionable records: as, who was the first priest that said mass, who invented the custom of praying for the dead, who instituted confession, extreme unction, invocation of saints, the custom of having images in the churches, and of giving them a relative honour, celebrating mass in Latin, the doctrine of transubstantiation, &c. &c. If these questions can be answered, from unquestionable records, to favour the Reformation, then, no doubt, Popery is leading us upon the ice; if the church be in an error, which most certainly is contrary to the promises of God in the Bible, and of Jesus Christ in the New Testament. The Reformation was not only erroneous, but open rebellion against the majesty of heaven and earth. We can easily trace the Church of Rome back to the Apostles, by an uninterrupted succession of Bishops in the chair of St. Peter, to the present Pope. There has been about two hundred and fifty-three Popes in the chair of Peter the Apostle, (himself being the first of them) since the commencement of Popery. I shall now say something of the charge of idolatry, as it is the greatest error a Christian can fall

into. I never could find a Protestant that would tell me who was the first priest who said mass, but I have seen some of the writings of St. Ignatius, the disciple of St. John, St. Irenæus, St. Cyprian, St. Martial, and Tertullian, teaching the doctrine of the mass, the substance or essence whereof consists precisely in its being an unbloody sacrifice offered to God, by the priests of the new law, upon the altar ; or what amounts to the same, an external oblation of the body and blood of Christ under the form of bread and wine. St. Irenæus says, That Christ taught a new oblation in the New Testament, which the church, receiving from the Apostles, does offer throughout the whole world. Iren. l. iv. c. 32. St. Cyprian says, That the priest is Christ's representative, and offers sacrifice to God the Father. Cyp. l. ii. c. 3. And the Fathers, in all ages, has declared the same doctrine, which makes Popery as ancient as Christianity in every fundamental point : and as for the cruel charge of idolatry, I shall here insert what every child, that is brought up in the Catholic faith, will answer from their Catechism. " Q. Do Catholics pray to images ? A. No, by no means ! we pray before them, indeed, to keep us from distractions, but not to them, for we know that they can neither see, nor hear, nor help us. Q. What benefit then have we by them ? A. They movingly represent to us the mysteries of our Saviour's passion, and the martyrdom of his saints. Q. What benefit have we by honouring and canonizing saints ? A. It strongly moves us to imitate their example, by showing their rewards. Q. How do we honour saints and angels ? A. With an inferior honour, as the friends and creatures of God, not as gods, nor with God's honour. Q. Is it lawful to honour relics of saints ? A. Yes, with a relative honour, as above explained ; for the handkerchiefs and aprons, which had but touched the body of St. Paul, cast out devils, and cured all diseases, Acts, xix. chap. and 12 verse." I will finish this subject with another quotation from another work, which, perhaps, you have not perused so much as " Free Thoughts : " it speaks as follows, " Cursed is he who commits adultery, (it should be idolatry) who prays to images or relics, or worships them for God, R. Amen. Cursed is every goddess worshipper, who believes the Virgin Mary to be any more than a creature, who worships her, or puts his trust in her more than God, who believes her above her son, or that she can in any thing command him, R. Amen. Cursed is he who believes the saints in heaven to be his redeemers, who prays to them as such, or who gives God's honour to them, or to any creature whatsoever, R. Amen. Cursed is he who worships any broaden god, or makes gods of the empty elements of bread and wine, R. Amen. Cursed is he who believes that priests can forgive sins, whether the sinner repent or not, or that there is any power on earth or heaven, that can forgive sins without a

heartly repentance, and serious purpose of amendment, R. Amen. Cursed is he who believes there is authority in the Pope, or any other person, that can give leave to commit sin, or that for a sum of money can forgive him his sins, R. Amen. Cursed is he who believes, that independent of the merits and passion of Christ, he can obtain salvation by his own good works, or make condign satisfaction for the guilt of his sins, or the pains eternally due to them, R. Amen." Papist. Misrep. and Rep. p. 98-99.—I shall not trouble you with any more quotations, as very possibly it will be but time and labour lost; but I am very much surprised that a gentleman, of any merit or candour, would conduct a controversy in the manner you have hitherto done: if you would banish prejudice from your mind, you would see that their own doctrine is the system you ought to engage, and not charge them with doctrines they hate as much as you do yourself. I do not suppose that any of them is so very stupid, as to expect that an image of any creature can give them any help or assistance whatever. If you would give their religion from their own books, (without misrepresentation) and then condemn them, if you can, with cool reasoning and fair argument, then your undertaking may be of some service. I suppose you would not wish to be tried by your enemies before a court of justice, if your life or character was at stake? Another cruel and unjust charge you have made against us is, that our mode of practice is "rebellion against God:" very well, then, be it so: let us be justified by the doctrine of the church of Scotland, part of it is as follows: "Q. What are the decrees of God? A. The decrees of God are his eternal purpose according to the counsel of his will, whereby for his own glory he hath foreordained whatsoever comes to pass," Short. Cat. page 1, 2. According to this doctrine, all our actions, good and bad, are all set before us, without exception, nor can we escape one of them. If this doctrine be true, what comes of our free-will? Likewise, if this doctrine be true, why are we in the esteem of other Christians, if every thing we do is laid before us as a necessity? Lastly, If this doctrine be genuine, all Europe is guilty of the same rebellion since the foundation of the world. If any person is guilty of treason, murder, or theft, he is tried and punished for it; and is it not rebellion against God to punish a man for doing what is not in his power to avoid? Be this doctrine true or false, Mahomet I. was the inventor of it; yet if you can prove the Church of Rome to be in an error in any one point of faith, I shall leave her as soon as I see any proof, for I am but a late convert from the church of Scotland, in which I was educated from my youth, and if I thought it possible to obtain salvation in any other, I would not be another day in her communion, but yet I believe that those who wish earnestly to know the truth may be saved, in whatever church he is in, if he is a

Christian, provided he with earnestly from his heart to serve God with all his strength.

“ I am very sorry that the distance between us is so far, or else I would have wrote a larger sheet ; however, I shall see what you will say against Papists in future, and if you can prove them (from undoubted records) to be so bad as you call them, I shall soon be reconverted back again : but you must bring better testimony than you have hitherto done ; and, likewise, you must not twist the quotations you bring from Papist books, or else you may depend on being less respected. For my own part, I am no way bigotted, I wish to see the weight of both sides of the question, and then I am better able to see which is the most just. I have only to recommend to you to give the faith of Papists from their own books (without any misrepresentations or false constructions) and you will be more respected by Protestants and Papists.

“ I remain, Sir, your very humble servant, a lover of the truth,
W. D.”

There is one thing in which W. D. and I are agreed, and which I shall notice first. I believe that a man may be saved whatsoever church he is in, *if he be a Christian*. There never was a more important *if* ; and *if* W. D. be a Christian, I call upon him to keep his word, and leave the Church of Rome immediately. He says, “ If I thought it possible to obtain salvation in any other, I would not be another day in her communion.” Well, he admits that he may be saved in any church, if he wishes earnestly to know the truth, and if he be a Christian, provided he wish earnestly from his heart to serve God with all his strength ; then, surely, it is possible for him to be saved in the church of Scotland, to which I invite him to return. If he shall remain another day in the Church of Rome, after reading this, he is not a man of his word, and is therefore not a Christian, but only a Papist, and one who does not wish from the heart to serve God with all his strength. I am disposed, however, to hope favourably of this person, from his candid declaration ; and whatever church he may join, when he has left Rome, I advise him to serve God in reality, and not to satisfy himself with *earnestly wishing* to do so. There is, I am afraid, a great and very prevalent error couched under these words : Persons who are conscious that they are not serving God, but their own lusts, attempt to quiet their consciences by an idea, that they earnestly wish to serve God if they could ; and they hope he will take the will for the deed ; but no man, who does not really serve God, ever earnestly wished to do it. When God, by his grace, brings a sinner to himself, he teaches him both to *will* and to *do*.

From the short acquaintance which W. D. has had with the Church of Rome, he seems to have found out that she is no better

than she should be; for he declares he would not stay in her another day, if it were *possible* to obtain salvation in any other. This is as much as to say, that he is heartily tired of her communion; he has no attachment to her for her own sake, or for the sake of her Head, but merely because somebody has persuaded him that he cannot be saved in any other, though he immediately disavows this persuasion. But let him join the true church of Christ, in whatsoever form she appears in the world, and *if he be a Christian*, he will love her communion for its own sake, and for the sake of Christ, who is the Head of the church, and who not only *will* save him, but who has saved him already, *if he be a Christian*.

The reader will observe, I use the word *Christian* in the Bible sense. A Christian is one who believes the Gospel, who is born again, who is really a disciple of Christ; that is, one who believes what Christ teaches, and does what he commands: for they were disciples who were called Christians first at Antioch, and the inspired writers never gave the name to any other. Now, the Apostle Paul says to such, not merely ye *shall be* saved, but “by grace ye *are* saved through faith, and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God.” Ephes. ii. 8. Again, he “*hath* saved us, and called us with an holy calling, not according to our works, but according to his own purpose and grace, which was given us in Christ Jesus before the world began.” 2 Tim. i. 9. It is true that, in respect of perfect holiness, and perfect happiness, salvation is future; but every Christian in this world is so far a saved person, that he is delivered from wrath and condemnation, is justified before God, and created anew for his service; and without this a man is not a Christian, whether he belong to the church of Rome, or any other church. I hope my readers will not suppose I am going to give them another Sermon; I am only dropping a word for the instruction of my correspondent, who, I suspect, has not found peace to his conscience in the Church of Rome.

I would farther advise W. D. not to meddle with the high doctrine of liberty and necessity, or fate and free-will, at least till he has become acquainted with the plain and simple truths contained in the Bible. Let him not imagine that he may safely do evil from a belief that he was predestinated to do it. The church of Scotland never taught such doctrine; and if this was the cause of his leaving her, he ought to return, and confess his mistake, and “be reconverted *back again*.”

My correspondent is much offended by the charge of idolatry which I bring against his church; but I appeal to himself whether I have not proved her guilty, to the conviction of every one who believes the testimony of his own senses; and there is no possibility of proving any thing to persons who do not believe their senses; for though I were to set down a mathematical demonstra-

tion in every page, they would not be sure that they saw it. What I made and meant for a square, they might call a triangle or a circle ; and what I knew to be good black ink, they might maintain to be butter-milk. There was, however, a time when W. D. believed his senses, if he was, as he says, a member of the church of Scotland. He cannot have forgotten this. If, then, he had seen a man adoring a piece of bread, he would have called him an idolater. If the worshipper should have told him it was not bread, but the God that made him ; instead of being convinced, I suppose W. D. would have called him mad as well as idolatrous. Now, though W. D. himself has become a believer in the wonderful conversion of a piece of bread into the real substance of the body and blood, soul and divinity, of Jesus Christ, and of course sees no idolatry in worshipping it, he must allow those who do not believe this doctrine, to think of the worship of a piece of bread as he once thought of it, that it is downright idolatry. This, I think, I have proved in some of my late Numbers, to which I refer him, if he is willing to believe his own senses ; if not, he may save himself the trouble, for it will be of no avail. He cannot be certain whether he is reading my print or his own manuscript.

I know that Papists disclaim idol worship, and that they do so with the most bitter cursing, of which W. D. has given a specimen from Gother's *Papist Misrepresented and Represented* ; but this is no more than heathens do, except the cursing part of the disavowal, which, I suppose, is peculiarly Popish. No man professes to worship an idol, believing it to be an idol, but because he believes a divinity to reside in it, or that it is itself a divinity. Every man who worships a creature is an idolater ; and he is not the less so, because he believes it to be the Creator ; and though he should pronounce ever so many curses against idol worshippers.

My correspondent proceeds upon a mistake, into which he, and, I suppose, all his brethren, have fallen,—that the church which Christ purchased with his blood, and of which he promised that the gates of hell should not prevail against her, is the visible organized Church of Rome. This they all seem to take for granted ; but it is a mere assumption, without a shadow of reason to support it. The church of Christ are the redeemed of all nations and of all ages ; and the gates of hell shall never prevail so as to prevent the salvation of any one of them. Those of them who are upon earth are scattered among a number of visible organized bodies, which, in an inferior sense, are called churches. The church in Rome was one of these, while she held the true faith and pure worship, as instituted by Christ ; but in her purest state she had no superiority over other churches ; she never had any right to call herself by way of eminence, much less exclusively, *the church*. Christ never gave to her, or to any national, provincial,

or particular church, a promise that the gates of hell should not prevail against it ; but he gave warning to all, that if they departed from the faith, they should be cut off. This has been notoriously the case with Rome ; and though she retains the name of Christian, she has become the reverse of what the name implies ; and is conspicuously the place where Satan has his seat.

In short, the promise of Christ holds out no security to either churches or individuals, but in the way of persevering in faith and holy practice. Christ said to his disciples, on one occasion, " Fear not, little flock, it is your Father's good pleasure to give you the kingdom." Luke xii. 34. Now, if Judas had argued as Papists do, he needed not to have thought himself in danger of perdition, though he had betrayed his Lord. He might have said, if Christ's word be true, I am sure of the kingdom of heaven. But Judas had not the presumption to reason like modern Papists. He apostatized, and he perished ; yet Christ spoke the truth, and his word will be verified in the salvation of all true disciples. The Church of Rome also apostatized ; and though Christ promised that the gates of hell should not prevail against *his* church, he has suffered them to prevail against that of Rome. He has removed the candlestick, that is the branch of his church that was once in Rome, out of the place, as he did to many other churches, for the same reason. Of some, indeed, the memory is perished from the earth ; but for reasons known fully to himself alone, he suffered the Church of Rome to retain a name and a visible form, after the spirit was gone, and to become the antitype of Babylon, the oppressor and persecutor of the church of God.

To know that a church is in error, it is not necessary to prove when, and by whom the error was first broached ; yet W. D. seems to express great triumph, because nobody can tell who said the first mass. Had he been a servant of the husbandman, in whose field tares had been sown, and had sprung up, he would not have believed that tares were in the field, though he saw them with his own eyes, unless somebody could tell who sowed them. To the master, and the wise servants, it appeared that the tares were sown while they were off their guard, and that it was the work of an enemy. This was evident from the actual state of the field, though they could tell no more about it. So the Church of Rome is now full of errors, though it be not easy to fix the precise time, or to name the persons by whom they were all introduced. She has departed from the unerring standard, she is many degrees distant from it ; we are therefore sure that she has erred, though we should not be able to tell who made the first wry step.

A few farther remarks on W. D.'s letter in my next.

THE
Protestant,

No. LXXI.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 20th, 1819.

My correspondent, W. D., whose letter I gave in my last Number, refuses to admit that the Church of Rome is in any error, because no Protestant can tell him who was the first that erred, or who said the first mass: to which I replied, that we found her far removed from the unerring standard; and that, therefore, we were sure that she had erred, though we could not tell who made the first wry step. I shall illustrate this by the following incident:—

I happened to be in Greenock a few weeks ago, in a very foggy night, when some gentlemen hired a boat to ferry them over to Helensburgh. They could not see above ten yards round them, and they had no compass. The men rowed with all their might for about two hours, when they made land, supposing it to be Helensburgh; but it turned out to be Cartsdyke, on the Greenock side of the river, and not half a mile distant from the place from which they started. Now, had W. D. been one of the company, he must, according to his mode of reasoning, have maintained that Cartsdyke was Helensburgh, unless somebody could tell which of the rowers had gained so upon the other, as insensibly to turn about the boat. But the sensible part of the company, seeing how matters stood, would confess that they had erred from their course, though they could not tell who gave the first stroke of the oar that led them astray.

In the thick and long continued darkness of Europe, it is not surprising that the great body of the people went astray from the truth, and wandered in the mazes of error. Indeed, it could not have been otherwise, without a perpetual miracle. But W. D. will admit of no error having been broached, unless we can produce a distinct record of its introduction; while the very darkness which facilitated the propagation of error, rendered it difficult, if not impossible, in many instances, to preserve such record: yet,

this writer most confidently assures us, that "there is no heresy whatever, nor any point of discipline that is, or ever was practised in the Church of Rome, or any other church whatever, but what is recorded by some historian; but we have no such records of the supposed errors of the Church of Rome." It is impossible that W. D. can know what he asserts in the first part of this sentence without inspiration; therefore we may let this pass till he shall make it appear that he is possessed of the gift: and as for the errors of the Church of Rome, we have enough on record to show us when some of the principal ones came to be publicly acknowledged as what is called Catholic doctrine. This is well known to every reader of Church history, but I am afraid I cannot rank W. D. among the number. Let him read Milner's Church History, or even his own Dupin, and he will see reason enough to be "reconverted back again."

He speaks of the succession of Popes from Peter, who, he says, was the first of them, with as much confidence as if it were a thing as clear and undisputed as the succession of our royal family from King James the First; but, if he be not a novice indeed, he must know that this is all nonsense. I defy him, and the whole Church of Rome, to produce a sentence from the genuine writings of any one of the Fathers, which distinctly proves that Peter ever was in Rome, much less that he was Bishop of that see. But as I intend to discuss this subject at length in some future Numbers, I shall not enter farther upon it here. My correspondent gives a list of Fathers, whose writings, he says, he has seen; but if I may judge from the manner in which he writes English, I suspect he cannot read these Fathers in the original languages. He must trust, therefore, to mere garbled scraps of translations, or barefaced forgeries, such as his priests are pleased to show him, and which are of no authority whatever. It is well known that the Church of Rome has, by her Index Expurgatorius, expunged from the works of the Fathers every passage that she judged contrary to her own doctrine; and that she has actually foisted into the blank spaces which the Index made, words which the authors never wrote, expressing sentiments which they never held. From such corrupted editions of the Fathers, Popish writers make their quotations. Indeed, if they were to use other editions, and give the genuine words of the Fathers, it would be at the peril of falling under the vengeance of the Inquisition, if they should ever come within its reach. If W. D. did not know of the existence of the Index, I hope he will thank me for the information; and as the fact is as notorious as the existence of the Fathers themselves, I hope he will hereafter pay little attention to what his ghostly guides may please to present him from St. Irenæus, or any saint of the Pope's mak-

ing; and that he will have recourse to his Bible, which will not lead him astray.

He quotes, apparently with approbation, Gother's curses upon those who believe, or do not believe, certain matters, or whose worship is not perfectly according to rule: thus, for instance, "Curs'd is he who worships any breaden god, or makes gods of the empty elements of bread and wine;" and the Respondent is taught to say, "Amen." This great curse leaves room enough for worshipping what appears to be bread and wine, though not as bread and wine; just as the curse pronounced upon every goddess-worshipper, leaves persons at full liberty to worship the Virgin Mary, provided they do not put their trust in her *more* than in God, or suppose that she is *above* her Son, or can *command* him. These are mere quibbles, intended to deceive simple Protestants, and to conceal the notorious fact that Papists do worship idols; and their denying the fact with such bitter cursing, only shows that they have no *honest* way of clearing themselves. We do not read that ever the apostle Peter had recourse to cursing, but when he was guilty of another great crime, and wished to conceal the truth.

In this article the Church of Rome shows herself to be the very opposite of the true church of Christ, whose motto is, "Bless and curse not." The promise of God to Abraham extends to the whole church—"I will bless thee, and make thee a blessing." She looks with a benign aspect towards the whole human race. She prays, and labours, that all men may be brought into the fold of Christ, that they may enjoy the blessing of Abraham, which is come upon the Gentiles. But if men will not come into the fold, in the way of believing in Christ, as God has commanded; if they will continue heathens and idolaters, Christians pity them, and pray for their conversion, but they are by no means warranted to curse them. I suppose W. D. thinks it his duty, most devoutly, to curse "THE PROTESTANT," in imitation of his brethren here, by whom he was, about a year ago, most heartily cursed, even from the pulpit; but I should reckon myself guilty of a great crime were I to curse either him or them. I shall be told, perhaps, that an Apostle says, If any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be anathema maranatha. An Apostle does, indeed, say so; but he is speaking by inspiration, and declaring the righteous judgment of God against the enemies of Christ, which shall be executed upon all the finally impenitent; and the company of the saved will cordially acquiesce in that sentence; but this is not a rule by which we are warranted to deal with fellow creatures in this world; or an example which we are to imitate, by cursing all whom we believe to be in error.

One remark more on this letter, and I shall have done with it. The writer very kindly advises me to give the religion of Papists from their own books, without misrepresentation, and then condemn them, if I can, with cool reasoning and fair argument. Now this is the very thing I have done all along. I have in no instance, so far as I recollect, ascribed any doctrine to the Church of Rome, at least no one of any importance; and I have founded no argument upon any doctrine ascribed to her without laying down the doctrine in the very words of her own authors. I have been very liberal in my extracts from these; but when any fundamental doctrine was in question, I have not satisfied myself with the authority of any individual author, however high in rank and reputation, though this should be enough in a church, in which the faith of one is declared to be the faith of all; but I have given the authority of Councils and Colleges, and Catechisms, which are admitted to contain and express the real doctrine of the Church of Rome. On the subject of not keeping faith with heretics, I gave the words of the Council of Constance, and showed how the doctrine was practised under the sanction of that Council. On the subject of withholding the Bible from the common people, I gave the words of the College of Rheims, and of the Council of Trent, and of several modern authors. On the subject of worshipping saints and images, I gave a number of extracts from approved books of devotion: and on transubstantiation, and the sacrifice of the mass, besides the words of several Catechisms, I cited the supreme authority of the Council of Trent. From such authentic sources I have carefully given the doctrines of the Church of Rome; and I defy W. D. to show that I have misquoted a single sentence.

In some instances, indeed, I have given the words of Popish authors as quoted by others; by such men, for instance, as Archbishop Usher and Archbishop Tillotson, whose names are a sufficient security against imposition; and, in a few instances, from the author of "Free Thoughts," who, though he chose to publish his work without his name, is well known to have been a respectable Presbyterian Professor of Divinity, and in nothing that became a minister of Christ inferior to the above-named primates of England and Ireland. I do not however rest so much upon the personal character of these great divines, as upon the fidelity of their quotations. They had access to more books than I have. I have given the words of Popish authors, as given literally, or translated by them, with reference to the books and pages; so that any man who has access to the original works, may try whether they have given the words or meaning faithfully. Had they made any misquotation or mistranslation, they would soon have been detected and exposed; and as this

was never done that I have heard of, I have no hesitation in taking the correctness of their quotations as admitted. And with regard to the last mentioned writer, the author of "Free Thoughts," though his book be anonymous, his quotations are not so, because he gives the names, and refers to the works and pages of the authors from whom he quotes. Authorities thus given are as authentic as if they came from the lips of the Pope of Rome; and, perhaps, more so. I know that some modern Papists do not admit the authority of the word of God, as given by the Protestant translators, though the words should be precisely the same as in their own version; so, perhaps, they will not admit the *very words* of their own authors as they appear in Protestant books; but this only shows that they cannot be reasoned with, according to any rule of reason or common sense.

In matters of fact, relating to Popish worship and practice, I do not think it necessary to confine myself to Popish authors. I know it is a rule with Papists, to believe nothing, and to deny every thing, which is attested by Protestant writers, however high in reputation, if it shall have the least tendency to expose the idolatry and superstition of the Church of Rome; but this only shows that their system cannot bear the inspection and the verdict of honest men. No candid person would reject the evidence of such men as Dr. Middleton, or of any man, whatever be his private religious sentiments, who gives a credible account of what he saw and heard, and when there appears no motive that he could have to deceive his readers. Besides, it is affirmed by other travellers, and not denied by Papists themselves, that all that Dr. Middleton ascribes to Popish worship is true; and of its conformity with heathenism, any classical scholar is able to judge.

I am quite aware that our Scottish Papists, who feel themselves unable to answer the arguments of THE PROTESTANT, and who feel hurt by the exposure which, from time to time, he makes of their impieties and extortions, endeavour to satisfy themselves and one another, with the reflection that he brings all his materials from books written by enemies of the Church of Rome. The assertion is not true; but if it were, they ought not to reject the evidence which he brings against them; for, in nine instances out of ten, the enemies of Rome will be found to tell the truth.

Having done my Popish correspondents the favour of printing every word that they have addressed to me, under their true character, it will be allowed to be but fair that I should treat my readers with one or two of the immense file of letters which I have received from Protestants. The following, which relates to the subject of not keeping faith with heretics, is from a clergy-

man in the country, who kindly authorizes me to give his name. I omit part of the first paragraph, which relates to matters of which my readers have had enough in my 50th Number, and in my Letter to Mr. M'Hardy. The paragraph concludes by assuring me, that I may depend on the truth of the statement; and that the "circumstances are recorded in the court books of the Stewartry of Kirkcudbright."

SIR,—IN the month of July, 1812, I was called to join in marriage two persons, the man a Papist, and the woman a Protestant. At the period of their marriage, the intended husband vowed, in the most solemn manner, not only to allow the woman the liberty of worshipping God according to her conscience, but also of having the female children who should proceed from the marriage, baptized by a Protestant clergyman, and brought up in the principles of the Protestant faith: she agreeing, at the same time, that the male children should be under his direction; it being understood by both parties that when the children came to years of understanding, they should have liberty of judging for themselves. All things went well till the month of June, 1813, when a female child was born. Immediately after, I was spoken to about baptism; but the husband had also applied to his priest to come forward and baptize it. At the earnest request of both parties, I was present at this intended meeting for baptism. I heard the afflicted mother, pale and weak from recent illness, tell her story with all the mildness of a Christian. I heard the priest, with sternness in his countenance, tell her, there was no help for her, that the principles of their church bound all their adherents to bring up all their children in the principles of the Church of Rome, and to have their children baptized by a Catholic clergyman. I reminded him that this was a particular case,—there was a solemn promise. It is a bad promise, said he, and therefore must be broken. I asked him to give me the definition of a bad promise. The answer I received was, *Any promise inconsistent with the principles and practice of our church.* Mr. Andrews, I hope, will observe this is not the assertion of a poor ignorant being, who could neither read nor write; but the declaration of a man to whom the *infallible* Church of Rome has committed the charge of the interests of four or five hundred immortal souls. He will observe, I trust, that the vow was not made under constraint, but emitted voluntarily, and made in the most solemn manner, in the presence of that God who hath said, he will not hold him guiltless that takes his name in vain. According to his own declaration, that in the Church of Rome, the faith of one is the faith of all, the meaning of the whole in plain English seems to be this,—That

no promise or vow, however solemn, is binding on any Papist, when it will further the interest of the Church of Rome to break it. As Mr. Andrews calls for facts, if this one will serve you, you are at liberty to use it in the manner you see most proper. I remain, Yours, &c.

Kilbride, July 16th, 1819.

ROBERT CAMERON."

From the above, I beg leave to repeat the warning which I gave to my Protestant countrywomen on a former occasion, that they beware of connecting themselves with Papists. They may be assured it will be a miserable connexion, unless they shall go over to their husbands' religion, and renounce the gospel of Christ, for the mass and the Virgin Mary. Then, indeed, they may be as happy as Papists can be under the iron rod, and the endless extortions of their ghostly guides: and if they have money to pay the priest, they may receive such assurances as he can give of happiness in another life; but if they are poor, they must shift for themselves. There is no mercy in the church of Rome. With her there is nothing but pay or perish.

The above certified case is only a sample of what very frequently takes place in such mixed marriages. The baptism of the first child is that which brings parties to the test. It was this that originated the quarrel between M^r Murray and his wife, and which led to his maltreating and abandoning both her and his child. Indeed, Papists are confessedly taken bound to have all their children baptized and brought up in what they call the only true church. If there be one more good natured than the rest, who chooses to indulge his Protestant wife in this matter, and allow her to get baptism to her child, in her own church, he is teased and tormented by his priest every time he goes to confession: and no wonder, as the priest considers himself robbed of his dues, which are no light matter, as we shall see by and by; and the poor man is also scouted at by all his brethren, as a lukewarm son of the church, and as a poor henpecked husband; an accusation which is not to be endured by any man of spirit. Hence he must compel his wife to yield to him the point of baptism by the priest, else he will wreak his vengeance on her, and make her life miserable.

A case lately occurred which will illustrate this matter. A Papist was brought before our Police-court for maltreating, and threatening to murder his Protestant wife. Another Gentleman and myself got the history of the case from the woman while she was in waiting in the office. She had been married little more than a year; and her husband had treated her pretty well till she had the child which was in her arms, and which appeared to be about two months old. She gave her consent, at least she did not hin-

der him from applying to Mr. Scott for baptism ; but on application, the priest demanded half a guinea, and would not take less. This being more than the poor man was able to pay, he went home to his wife in dudgeon, and consented to go with her to her own minister, from whom she received baptism to her child for nothing ; but he soon appeared to have repented of his compliance. Whether this was owing to the taunts of his brethren, or the severe penance imposed by his priest, I cannot tell ; but from that time he began to look down upon his wife ; repeatedly beat her, as was declared by herself and some of her neighbours in open court : and she declared that she was in fear of her life.

The husband, when called upon for his defence, admitted that he was one of Mr. Scott's people, and did not deny the fact of beating his wife, which was indeed distinctly proved ; but he pleaded that he did not beat her because *she* was a Protestant, but because *he* was *drunk* ; and that he could not well restrain himself when in that state. He was dismissed with a reprimand and suitable advice ; and I heard the woman say, after leaving the court, that she durst not for her life go home to him ; but that she would go with her infant to her friends in the north, if she should beg her way. This, I suppose, she has done, for on making inquiry lately of the elder of her district, to whom she had been known, I could hear nothing of her. The minister who baptized the child had previously told me the fact of a man and a woman coming to him, as described above, and particularly, that the man gave as his reason for coming to him, that Mr. Scott demanded half-a-guinea for the baptism ; but whether this was the neat price of the job, or whether it might not include some arrears, I cannot tell. Be this as it may, it must be allowed by every good Papist, that it was better that the child should perish under the guilt of heretical baptism, or without baptism, than that the priest should go without his half-guinea.

The man was one of the wildest looking fellows I had ever seen. His body was covered with a few woollen rags ; so far as appeared, he had no shirt ; he accused his wife of having taken some things out of his house ; and in her defence, she stated, what was not denied by him, that she had put her blankets into a neighbour's house to save them from being taken away by him, and sold for liquor. This is a specimen of " Mr. Scott's people." This is a true son of the church ; one who has been regenerated by baptism, and who wants nothing but the absolution of Mr. Scott, when he comes to die, to carry him right to heaven, at least to heaven by way of Purgatory : but, what is of more importance than all, this is one of the subjects from whom the priest humanely exacts half-a-guinea for his baptism of a child, which really is not worth half-a-farthing.

More of such matter in my next.

THE
Protestant,

No. LXXII.

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 27th, 1819.

IN my last Number, I alluded, in general terms, to the subject of mixed marriages, and showed the great misery that was likely to result from the union of Protestants with Papists. I have never heard of such a union being productive of happiness, in so much as one instance; and I am verily persuaded, that happiness, in the very lowest sense of the word, cannot be the result of such a connexion, without the entire sacrifice of principle on both sides; and then, to be sure, the parties may be as happy as other heathens in the married state;—or without the Protestant party falling into the religion of the Papist, so as to do away the distinction between them; and then they may live like other good and quiet children of Rome.

A man or a woman, being under the influence of Christian principles, would, I think, be very cautious with regard to the principles, as well as the character, of the person with whom he or she was to be united for life. There is, perhaps, little danger of such persons as the above forming a connexion with Papists. Real Christians have learned not to be unequally yoked; and the inequality between a real Christian and a real Papist, is so manifest at first view, that I cannot contemplate the possibility of such a union, without supposing a dereliction of principle, at least on the part of the former. The danger exists chiefly among thoughtless young persons, who have been born and brought up among Protestants, but who have received no religious education, and who do not know what real Christianity is. They are chiefly young females who, in this part of the kingdom, are in danger of becoming victims; for the influx of males, from the Popish part of the empire, in search of employment, is much greater than that of females; and there must, of course, be many Popish young men willing to take wives of our Protestant women, while there

are few or none of our Protestant young men, who would think of taking Popish wives.

Now, what is the consequence of a union between a Popish husband and a Protestant wife? Suppose the wife is like a great part of our female population, merely a creature for this world, who has never been taught to look forward to another world, or to consider her interest in it; she will, of course, look upon one religion as quite as good as another; and she cannot think of a better one than that of her husband, if he be but tolerably kind to her; she is therefore easily prevailed upon to fall into it. The husband, on the other hand, looks upon his religion as every thing to him. He may be a very sober man, or he may be ever so licentious. The difference of character will make no difference in his relation to the Church of Rome, or in his zeal for her glory and increase. He will imagine no action so meritorious in itself, or that will recommend him more to his brethren, than the conversion of a heretic; his heart, in short, becomes set upon this object; and as the only heretic under his influence is his wife, he will never rest till he has brought her fully over to his mother church. It is in this way, I am credibly informed, that Popery has of late increased so much in England. Mixed marriages generally issue in bringing the Protestant party over to Popery; because the Protestant originally had no fixed religious principle of any kind, while the Papist was, in heart and soul, devoted to Popery: and all the children of such marriages are usually baptized and educated in the Church of Rome. I do not believe that Popery, in Glasgow, has yet increased much from this cause. I question if Mr. Scott has, in his whole flock, half a dozen of adults who were born in Glasgow. The great bulk are Irish; there are a few from the North Highlands; and a few foreigners.

Sometimes, indeed, as in the case mentioned by a correspondent in my last Number, there is a mutual stipulation, that the children of one sex shall be baptized and educated in the father's religion, and of the other sex in the mother's. In the case referred to, the agreement seems to have been made by the Popish husband, without considering himself bound to observe it; at least it appeared, when he was brought to the test, that he paid more regard to the dispensation of his priest, than to his own solemn oath; and that he did not scruple to break faith with his wife. Indeed, it would be foolish to expect any thing else, without absolute indifference on both sides; for the side on which party zeal predominates will carry it against the more liberal. If both are equally zealous, the family will become a scene of perpetual discord; and the weaker vessel, whether it be the man or the wife, must ultimately give in.

It must be an odd sort of a schism that exists in families subject to such an arrangement as the above ; and the effect must be extremely pernicious to the children. A friend of mine had, last year, an opportunity of witnessing this at one of the English watering places. There happened to lodge, under the same roof, a lady governess, having under her charge several children, the family of a Baronet, whose lady was a Papist. It seems the agreement between the father and the mother of the children was, that the boys should be bred Protestants, and the girls Papists ; and so far as is known, the agreement had been adhered to ; but this said governess was the teacher of all the children, male and female ; and she found herself in the awkward predicament of honest Cuddy, in " Old Mortality," who, between the clashing lessons of his tory lady and his whig mother, could not help, when he was catechised, blending the chief end of man with god-fathers and godmothers, so as to mar the sense of both the Catechisms which he had been set to learn. This lady actually complained of the hardship of her lot, in being obliged to teach the English prayers to the boys, and the Romish ones to the girls. She had no preference of the one above the other, but only grudged the double labour of teaching and listening to both : and she actually asked my friend's opinion, whether it would not be lawful to go over to the Church of Rome, especially as her ladyship's confessor, who lived in the family, had offered her ten guineas (which, she said, would buy many fine things), if she would become a convert, using as an argument, that they had had no converts for some time, and it kept up their spirits to have one now and then.

I make use of this anecdote merely to show the miserable condition of the children, where such an arrangement as the above has been made. It is impossible for a conscientious Christian, father or mother, to witness, with indifference, their children of either sex, educated in what they heartily believe to be a false religion. If, therefore, both parties adhere to the agreement, both must abandon the children to some mercenary creature, who has no religion at all ; for if they were to pitch upon a religious person to be the teacher, they could not prevent the religion of the teacher from being inculcated upon the children. In the case of the family referred to, it is easy to see what will be the issue with regard to the children of both sexes, seeing there is a priest living in the family, and a governess, almost willing to become his tool, for the slender bribe of ten guineas.

I return now to a subject of a more private and local nature. My readers have already been informed of the numerous extor-

tions practised upon the poor Papists in Glasgow, in order to raise and uphold the magnificent establishment in Clyde Street. In addition to my former statements on this subject, take the following case, which is officially certified by the Clerk of the Town's Hospital, and is introduced by a letter from him, as follows :—

Glasgow Town's Hospital, September, 1819.

SIR,

At the desire of the gentlemen of this institution, I transmit to you the following facts, that you may make use of them, if you think proper, in your Paper, *THE PROTESTANT*. The gentlemen of the Committee were much surprised at the conduct of Mr. Scott in the affair, and were desirous to be personally informed of the case. A part of their number accordingly called upon the woman, when, in the presence of four individuals, she went over the facts stated in the Superintendent's Report; and declared, that she was ready to depone upon oath, as to their verity.

She then farther stated, that Mr. Scott would not recommend her children for admission into the Catholic Schools, till she threatened, that if he would not, she would apply to get them admitted into one of the Protestant Charity Schools. And, in corroboration of the fact, regarding the *charge* made by Mr. Scott, she mentioned that it was a gentleman, named Mr. Kerr, whom she employed to wait on the priest, in order to obtain baptism for her child. The gentlemen of the Committee also waited upon this person, who resides in High Street. I forget the number, but I was in his house. He being a Catholic also, soon suspected the drift of the enquiry; and, with their characteristic cunning on such occasions, did all in his power to elude giving the information wanted.

He, however, distinctly *admitted*, that though he used a good deal of entreaty with Mr. Scott in behalf of the poor woman; yet, that he found it necessary to pay to Mr. Scott the eight shillings mentioned in the woman's story, before he would consent to baptize the child. This man's wife, who was not a Catholic, was strongly inclined to give some additional information respecting the case, but was silenced by her husband.

The Committee have frequently had occasion to believe that some of their pensioners were in the habit of contributing towards the erection of the chapel; but they thought this case too particular a one to be passed over in the customary silence. Here follows the Superintendent's Report, read to the Committee, which he made up in his annual visitation of the Hospital poor :—

“ 20th August, 1819. Betty Dochie, alias Widow Hanlin,

44, Bridgegate, aged 36, has three children :—Helen, 5 years and 3 months ; Michael, 3 years ; and Alice, 8 months. Has thirty shillings quarterly from the hospital ; no other supply. She strips feathers ; has three other children variously employed. Her husband died in January last ; had, before his death, given to Mr. Scott *four pounds* ; but had fallen back in his payments, in consequence of which, Mr. Scott refused to recommend the children for admission to the Popish Schools. Nor would he baptize the infant, which was only two months old at its father's death, till the mother pawned a pair of blankets, for five shillings, and borrowed three shillings from a friend, and paid Mr. Scott eight shillings ; partly for christening the child, and partly for her husband's arrears. She says she will declare the above to be truth, before God and man."

I am, &c.

WILLIAM SYM, *Clerk.*

Thus it seems we are assessed, not for the support of our own poor brethren only, but also for the support of widows and orphans of Papists, who have been impoverished by the extortion of their priest ; and thus the good citizens of Glasgow, who lately made so bold a stand against being taxed for the purpose of building parish churches, are actually, though indirectly, taxed for the building and support of a Popish chapel !

Thus far I had proceeded in composing the present Number, when I received some farther information, from the same authentic source, with regard to Mr. Scott and Widow Hanlin, which justice to both parties requires me to communicate. On Martinmas day, when the widow called at the Hospital for her half-quarter's allowance, she stated that, about a month before that, Mr. Scott had called upon her, and that without upbraiding her for divulging the story which I have given above, he returned to her the eight shillings which he had extorted from her for the baptism of her child, &c. ; and farther, that he had given her 12 lbs. of meal per week, for three weeks ; and that, moreover, he had charged her to tell this to no man.

I hope Mr. Scott will believe me, when I say that this is the best thing I ever heard of him ; and as I am assured that he had been informed that the widow's case had been communicated to me, he will allow me to congratulate myself, as the happy instrument, of not only relieving the widow, but also of producing a benevolent feeling in his mind, to which, perhaps, he had been too long a stranger. If Mr. Scott be possessed of human feelings, he must have had more pleasure in returning these eight shillings to the poor widow, and in giving her a little meal, than

in the many thousand pounds which have been extorted from persons almost as poor as she. Nay, I will venture to assert, that he never felt so much pleasure in contemplating the lofty minarets of his chapel, or the spacious rooms of his manse, with the extortions, by means of which they were reared, as he felt when he put the silver into the widow's hands.

This, however, is not the first instance of restitution that is on record. The reader will recollect a case, in my ninth Number, in which a whole shilling was restored, after having been extorted from a poor sick person ; and if more instances had been communicated to me, I should gladly have recorded them. It is pleasant to see that the work of restitution has begun, and proceeded so far ; because this is one evidence, that the extortioner has begun to repent ; and though the extortion itself has produced nearly twenty thousand pounds, and though the amount of the restitution is, upon the whole, only nine shillings in money, and four pecks and a half of oatmeal, we must not be discouraged, but hope for the best, knowing that the greatest things in the world, even Rome itself, arose out of small beginnings.

Protestants have no idea of the immense sums of money which are levied upon Papists by their ghostly instructors. The Clyde Street chapel is, indeed, a standing monument and proof that the priest has access to the purses of the people, in a manner almost incomprehensible by Protestants. The following will show in what manner money is raised among the poor in Ireland: I copy the document from the SUN newspaper, of February 2d, 1819:—

“ CIRCULAR SUGGESTED FOR PAROCHIAL SUBSCRIPTIONS. To appoint a person in each parish to make individual application to each householder.—This person shall take with him to each village, or farm, a list of the householders, and shall apply to each of them, whether he was willing to contribute *tenpence*, or any higher sum, toward defraying the expenses of the Catholic petitions.—Each person paying should be marked down as paid, and the sum inserted in the margin.—Each person refusing, should have the words *refused to contribute tenpence*, added to his name.—And a second application should be made to those who refuse, *with an intimation, that the list would be read in the chapel the ensuing Sunday*.—The list should be read at the chapel, as soon as it was ascertained that no more could be collected.—The more wealthy persons will, of course, contribute more than tenpence ; but no sum should be received from any person, save what he can afford to give, with the most perfect convenience.

“ Sir,—I am directed by the Committee of accounts to send you the above plan, and to request your attention to it. It will not be easy to carry this plan into effect, without the counte-

nance of the Catholic clergy; but it is presumed, from their constant attention to the interests of their countrymen, that they will give the plan the support of their advice. It is also expected that you will transmit to the board, an account of the parishes in the county in which you reside, in which this plan shall be carried into effect. You cannot do a greater service to the Catholic cause, than by exerting yourself, on this occasion, as the funds of the Board are quite exhausted, and it will be impossible to transmit our petitions to Parliament, unless subscriptions are collected. The mode of carrying this plan into effect is, of course, left with you; but it is hoped you will not refuse to give your zealous and active assistance. I have the honour to be, your very obedient humble servant,

“ DANIEL O’CONNELL.”

On the above circular, a correspondent of the Sun, writes:—
“ Here’s an engine, Sir, strong enough to lift the Protestant establishment off its centre; and at work nearly these five years, unchecked and unnoticed! But I will forbear all comment, until I startle your readers with a little gentle instruction about the sum which the “circular” motion of this steam-engine was calculated to raise.

“ The Popish Board, under whose authority the above curious document was issued, reckons, by its accredited “statement,” the enumeration of the “emphatic” people of Ireland, the Papists, at four millions, two hundred thousand; reckoning then the subscribing patriots at *two-thirds*, their tenpennies would produce an impost of one hundred and sixteen thousand, six hundred and sixty-six pounds. I will, however, be candid enough not to take them upon their own deliberate exaggeration, but on a truer and more moderate standard. I will count them only as two-thirds of their vaunted number, and, of course, at two-thirds only of the above contribution. Still there will remain a subscription for the use of the Board, of SEVENTY SEVEN THOUSAND SEVEN HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-SIX POUNDS, without calculating “the more wealthy persons, who, of course, contribute more than tenpence.” Supposing this, as we well may, a monthly contribution, it has produced the annual sum of nine hundred and thirty-three thousand, three hundred and twelve pounds: which for the last four years, from 1814, it would not be fair, Sir, to include the ways and means of 1819, as already raised, makes an aggregate sum of more than three millions, seven hundred thousand pounds, collected from the Papists of Ireland, by her controlling and managing Board. —Talk of the King’s taxes after this!”

I think this writer must be mistaken in supposing the above

tenpennies collected monthly I see no evidence of this in the circular itself; and I should rather suppose them collected only annually, according to the annual occasion of petitioning. This reduces the sum to a twelfth part of what is above stated; and yet it is sufficiently enormous to justify the following remarks, by the same writer:—

“ Now, Sir, what occasion, what honest and lawful occasion, had the Board for such a sum? I acquit its members of pocketing this money among themselves: but, after accounting for all their public expenses—their agents’ bills for prosecutions and defences, their counsellors’ fees, the fines of their convicted libellers, their salaries of their seditious newspapers, the secret service money of their threshers, and carders, and ribbon men, the annuities of their suffering patriots, and the representatives of their executed martyrs; nay, their presents to one another of cups and side-boards, a tolerable sum will remain; of which, *unless expended in the purchase of boroughs*, I call upon the Board and its collectors to state the application. Silence will convict them.

“ If you knew, Mr. Editor, the delusions practised upon the poor ignorant Papists in Ireland, the irritations with which they are perpetually fevered, and the more than despotic authority with which their priests trample upon both body and soul, you would readily believe the facility of levying, even the enormous sum which I have stated. The means too of compelling the refractory, are more “*emphatic*” than even tax-gatherer or tithe-proctor can adopt. To read the name of the recusant in the public chapel, was an especial mode of enforcing contributions.” —“ Protestants! Look to yourselves, Popery is awake,—ye are asleep:—Popery is busy,—ye are idle:—Popery is ever doing something—ye are never doing any thing.”

One cannot but perceive a little of the Jesuit in the plan above recommended for raising subscriptions. It is ordered, that no sum shall be received from any person, save what he can afford to give with the utmost convenience. Now this serves as a ready, and will be considered by many, as a sufficient reply to any person who shall accuse the Board of oppression and extortion. But then every person, *without exception*, who refuses to pay tence, is to have the fact written opposite his name; and his name, and his refusing to pay tence for the sake of “*Catholic emancipation*,” are to be publicly announced in the chapel. This is hanging a sword over the head of the very poorest; and, though he should not have a potatoe to his supper, woe be to the man who does not pay tence!

THE
Protestant,

No. LXXIII.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 4th, 1819.

A CORRESPONDENT has favoured me with a lively description of a Popish ceremony, which he had an opportunity of witnessing, and which, without farther preface, I shall lay before my readers :—

“ DEAR SIR,

It was my fortune last year to visit Canada, where I had an opportunity of witnessing some of the delusions of Popery. An account of some of these scenes may, perhaps, be useful, and it is certainly incumbent on all who have it in their power, to co-operate in the good fight which you have so manfully undertaken, and are so successfully maintaining, against those who put darkness for light, and substitute the doctrines of devils for the precepts of God's word. While in Montreal, in the month of November, last year, I learned that two new bells were about to be placed in the steeple of the principal church, and that, previously to being suspended, it was necessary that they should be baptized. The baptism of a bell, a piece of inanimate matter, was to me a novelty : I had often seen the ordinance administered both by those who believe in infant baptism, and by those who do not, but such a profanation of that sacred rite being no longer heard of in my native country, I never expected to have had an opportunity of witnessing it. Surely, thought I, these priests are either themselves most pitiable dupes of the deceiver, or they are most bare-faced impostors. Common sense seems by them to be laughed at; and they appear to put their ingenuity to the stretch to discover the way of most effectually insulting the understandings of the ignorant Canadians, and of most openly degrading and ridiculing the institutions of the kingdom of Christ. As it happened to be on a week day, I resolved to be a spectator; had it been on the Lord's day, I

should not have felt myself justifiable in so appropriating holy time. About two o'clock, the principal bell (for there are several in the steeple) began to ring, and I repaired to the church: the people were assembling in considerable numbers, and from the eagerness with which they scrambled over the pews to get into a good situation for seeing, I suspect the greater number present, even of the papists, were influenced more by curiosity than devotion; one proof among many that the Popish religion consists chiefly of ceremonial mummery, incapable of instructing the understanding, or touching the heart, and is not intended to regulate the affections or influence the conduct of those who profess it. The two bells were suspended from a temporary erection of wood in the centre of the church; in the vacant space round them, a table and chairs were placed for the principal performers. The candles on the altar at the upper end of the church were lighted in readiness for the exhibition, and in a short time a door on the left of the altar opened, and forth came the procession. At the head of it were two boys dressed in white, carrying two immense candles, each of which, with the candlestick, might probably measure seven or eight feet. After them came the priests, some in gorgeous silken robes, some in white, others in black, and some flaring with bright colours and gold; other boys also in white followed, one of whom bore a silver vase with water, and another a small vessel of oil. Some of the priests in black took their seats near the altar, the rest came forward to the bells; the large candles were placed upon the table, and beside them the vase and the vessel of oil. One of the priests, an old man dressed in white, then got up into the pulpit at the side of the church, to address the people; but he seemed not a little offended with the want of decorum that appeared in the assembly, for there was a good deal of pushing and squeezing, and most were standing on the seats that they might see over the heads of those before them;—he told them, in a pretty long harangue, in the French language, that this was a religious ceremony, and must be attended to with solemnity and decorum: he talked to them of the pious feelings which ought to be produced in their minds by seeing bells baptized, and the veneration and awe which it was to be expected they would feel. The people, however, were far from being so profoundly devout as he wished them, and a little noise still interrupting his reverence, he clapped his hands, and very angrily told them that if they did not behave better he would turn them all out. Descending from the pulpit, he put on a robe of various bright colours, and proceeded to the ceremonial. After chaunting a hymn he read Latin prayers over the water in the basin, and thus, I suppose, consecrated it; another of the priests then carried the basin to the bells, and the first dipped a

pretty large brush in the water, and with it made the form of the cross upon the bell, pronouncing words which I could not hear, but which could be nothing else than the solemn form used on such occasions, *In nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti* ; a third priest, with another brush, completed his work, making cross after cross, and then carefully brushing the intermediate places till the bell was wetted all over ; the second bell was crossed and recrossed, in the same manner, and immediately large clean towels were produced, and the bells were carefully wiped dry. Returning to the table, singing and reading of prayers succeeded, and the oil was next blessed and made holy ; the principal priest then dipped his finger in the oil, and made the sign of the cross on one place on each bell, carefully wiping the place with cotton wool, he then repeated it on a great many places on the bells both inside and outside, carefully wiping them as before with cotton. During the singing which followed, one of the boys went out and brought in a silver censer with red coals in it : a small box of incense stood on the table, out of which the priest took a spoonful and threw it on the coals, reading prayers over it as before ; the incense smoked up and perfumed the air ; then, after waving the censer with great solemnity three times, he carried it first to the one bell and then to the other, holding it under them till they were filled with the smoke. An important part of the ceremony yet remained, the bells had to get their names, for without that they could not be Christian bells, and as the baptismal vows could not be taken by themselves, the holy infallible church thought it necessary that sponsors should do it for them ; accordingly a god-father and a god-mother for each bell, were in waiting,—two reverend old couples, who were sitting with the priests beside the tables ; these were now brought forward and stationed, the one gentleman and lady at the one bell, and the other two at the other. The principal priest then put some questions to the first old gentleman and lady, which they answered ; but I was not near enough to hear what they vowed on behalf of the bell : the bell then received its name, and the priest taking the clapper gave three strokes against the side ; the old god-father then took hold of it and did the same, and last of all the old lady the god-mother. The priest leaving them went through the same ceremony with the couple at the other bell, and thus the two bells were baptized, got their names, and were made to speak. The name of the one, as I afterwards learned, began *Pierre Marguerite*, with some addition which has escaped me ; I do not know that I heard the name of the other. All was not yet over, the god-fathers and god-mothers, to crown the whole, produced their presents to their adopted children, and certainly nothing could be more suitable than clothes to the orphans ; a large piece

of linen was given to one of the priests, who with much solemnity wound it several times round the bell, next a large piece of crimson silk which was put over the linen, and last of all fringes and white silk ribands, which served to tie all on; the other couple were not to be outdone in generosity, and their linen, and silk, and ribands were also produced, and the second bell duly and decorously clothed; it was even somewhat gayer than its neighbour, for the silk bestowed upon it was very richly figured. Thus ended the sacrilegious rite of baptizing church bells! The boys elevated the large candlesticks, and the procession of priests departed as it had entered. In a day or two after, the bells were suspended in the steeple, fully qualified to ring souls out of purgatory, and perform all the other important duties of Popish bells. Let not your readers start at the idea of bells effecting the release of the souls of the departed from the fangs of the tormentor; I believe, indeed, that this is far beyond the ability of our heretical presbyterian bells, but nothing is too hard for a bell that has received Papistical baptism. While I remained at Montreal, *All Saints' day* came round, which is one in which the bells have their hands full of work; prayers are then offered up for the souls of all departed saints; high mass is performed for their benefit; and the bells are rung loud and long to effect their release. Passing the church door in the evening, I stepped in to see what was going forward; the services of the day were over, and there was no light in the church, except from the glimmering of a small oil lamp, which is kept constantly burning before the altar. In different places were several of the poor ignorant Canadians on their knees, praying for the souls of their dead relations, crossing themselves with great fervour; taking care, as they went out and came in, not to omit a daubing with holy water. In the middle passage a platform was erected, painted black, adorned with skulls and crossed bones, and on the top of it lay a coffin. This was emblematical of the dead for whom they were praying, and was intended to increase the fervour and the efficacy of their prayers. The bells were kept ringing almost the whole day; and according to the time that they were rung, and the number of masses and prayers that were said, a proportionate number of the dead were to be released from purgatory. That afternoon the bells are allowed to be rung by all who choose, and the poor creatures pulled away without intermission, vainly believing that the harder and the longer they rang, the sooner they would get their friends emancipated from Satan's house of correction. Next day, and for several days after, I saw a painted board suspended on a church door, inscribed, '*Indulgence plenièrre pour les morts,*' '*Plenary indulgence for the dead;*' and I was informed, that whoever, during these days, confessed to a priest, should

have forty days remission, after his death, of the pains of purgatory.

“ These are some of the ‘ doctrines of devils’ which are taught by the holy Roman Catholic Church ; and this is a faithful account of some of the rites and ceremonies of which I was an eye and ear-witness. I am, &c. J. M. D.”

Another correspondent has favoured me with a description of a similar ceremony at Naples, extracted from a letter of an English traveller, in the London Magazine for 1780. A noble lord was god-father to the bell, and a lady of quality was god-mother. Most of the prayers said on the occasion, ended with the following words : *Ut hoc tintinnabulum cœlesti benedictione perfundere, purificare, sanctificare, et consecrare dignareris* : “ that thou wouldst be pleased to rinse, purify, sanctify, and consecrate these bells with thy heavenly benediction.” The following were the words of consecration : *Consecretur et Sanctificetur signum istud, in nomine Patris, et Filii et Spiritus Sancti. Amen.* “ Let the sign be consecrated and sanctified, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.” The bishop then turning to the people, said, The bell’s name is Mary. He had previously demanded of the god-father and god-mother what name they would have put upon the bell, and the lady gave it this name.

The Canadian Popish ceremony above described reminds me of the communication of another correspondent, which has been lying past me for a long time. The writer is an American gentleman, who has made a tour of some of the United States, and into Canada, as far as the Falls of Niagara. I received the communication, indeed, before the commencement of my work, so that it cannot be considered as having any reference to my controversy with the Church of Rome. But along with a great variety of particulars, which would form an interesting little volume, there is an account of two or three convents and nunneries, which, I think, will be interesting to my readers, and which, therefore, I shall extract. The writer had the privilege which few Protestants have had, that of examining the interior of a nunnery :—

“ The greatest object of curiosity,” says my correspondent, “ which Montreal afforded, in my estimation, were the convents ; but most of our acquaintances being Protestants, we had been several days in the city, without finding any person who had the influence to procure us admission.

“ I mentioned this circumstance to a gentleman, in whose house we were one day dining, and I met with a reply which led to the object in view. The morning following we received the compliments of his family, with an offer of conducting us through

the convents that afternoon. Upon going to the house, we found that professional duties had called Dr. ——— from home; but his lady (who holds some religious function in the Romish church) and her daughters were ready to accompany us. The first to which we were led, was that of the order of St. ———. After shutting the wall gates, and sending a ceremonious message to the priest, we were admitted into the medicine room. The door was opened by a very old nun, to whom we were formally introduced. Nothing being here, but an extensive assortment of drugs, kept with great cleanliness, we ascended a stair, and were conducted through a number of large rooms, appropriated to the several religious rites through which the nuns go. Many of these rooms are most gorgeously decorated with the symbols of the Popish faith; such as crucifixes, representations of Christ, of the Virgin Mary, Scripture paintings, portraits of the Popes, and of the most eminent priests of the convent, &c. After a long succession of such apartments, the number of which I do not recollect, we were ushered into a large hall, used as a sitting-room by the nuns, a great number of whom were in it at the time. On our entrance, two of the oldest stepped forward, to whom, being introduced by Mrs. ———, we were requested to take seats. I was not a little surprised by this invitation, which appeared to me so much more familiar than, by general accounts, the manners of a nunnery would admit. Guided, however, in my conduct entirely by that of Mrs. ——— and her daughters, I seated myself between one of the latter and an old nun, who bounded the row we had formed. I at first addressed myself to the nun, asking several questions relative to the convent, and was answered in the best English she could speak; but my questions probably multiplying too fast for her command of English, she referred me to the young lady at my right hand, who, she observed, had been educated in a convent, and could inform me of every thing relating to them. Turning round, I repeated what the venerable nun had said to Miss ———, who acknowledged the mentioned education, and answered all my interrogatories.

“Rising again from our seats, we were led through a long entry, on each side of which was a row of bed chambers, till coming to the end of it, where there was a window communicating with the chapel, we looked to see whether admittance could be gained. On our first arrival at the window, there appeared a priest in the act of devotion before the altar. The continuance of his prayer, however, was not long, or we should have lost our view of the chapel. While we waited in the entry, the idea occurred to me, of peeping into one of these chambers. In case of committing an offence in doing so, I asked at one of the young

ladies, if indulging my whim would be improper; to which she, with a smile, replied, "Not more improper than going into any lady's chamber!" I hesitated no longer, but seeing the old nun's back turned, gently opened one of the doors, and gratified my curiosity." My correspondent describes the size and furniture of the room; but the only object which distinguished it particularly from such apartments in our own country, was an image of Christ's ascension, placed conspicuously on a table.

"The priest in the chapel had by this time finished his prayer upon which I shut the chamber door, and followed our party. We now descended the stair again, and were taken by a circuitous course to the great door. The chapel is a large and elegant apartment, extending to the full height of the building, which is three stories. The style of it is a demi-gothic, large pillars intersecting the wall, at short distances, and meeting at the top in arches. In the middle stands the altar, most superbly decorated with paintings, images, and all other ornaments that are used for such purposes. A handsome parapet divides the whole into two parts; one of which is occupied by the nuns, the other by the young females who are educated within the convent. We were about retiring, when one of the young ladies, pointing to a corner, which I had passed unnoticed, desired me to look where all the sins were confessed. On casting my eyes to the place, I saw a box, resembling a projecting closet; and addressing my informant, I asked, if so small a place could contain all her sins? To this question she made no reply, but, 'step forward, and hear some of them.' She walked into the open division; and I, to humour the joke, entered the priest's place. At this she barred the door, and, stepping out, desired me to follow. I had certainly now come under penance for this act of sacrilege, had not the fear of the old nun's eye hastened my release.

"Into the school-room, which projects from the main building, we were led up by a different stair; and, passing through one large room, entered another, in which were the scholars. There were no less than forty girls in the room, all at their respective tasks, in the different branches of reading, writing, arithmetic, and sewing. The ages of these children might probably be from seven to fourteen. The term of education in the convent is five years, during which period, the pupils are permitted only once a month to go beyond the walls; a confinement which, at so early an age, can hardly be productive of good consequences."

My correspondent was conducted to another nunnery, in which one of his lady companions had been educated, and where of course, they felt more at home. "We had not sat long," says he, "before I observed a great intimacy between Miss ——— and one of the young nuns. Wishing to join in their conversa-

sion, I took the liberty of interrupting it with a remark of my own ; and as both happened to have a great share of affability, I soon succeeded in becoming a party in the discourse. The young nun, I found, possessed a mind extremely well cultivated, together with an exterior gracefulness, which seemed more a polish received from the liberal circles of fashion, than an acquirement from the reserved manners of a nunnery. The great variety of ages among the nuns induced me to ask her how the employments were shared among them ; to which I was answered to the following effect :—‘ The youngest of us are chiefly employed in making clothes for the pupils, and for the old nuns who are incapable of doing it for themselves ; those of a more advanced age, teach, and employ themselves often with sewing for charitable purposes ; sometimes also in doing work for the mantua-makers, from whom the convent receives a compensation. Conserves, cordials, and many such things, are made by those who best understand them.’ ‘ And by these means, Madam,’ I observed, ‘ those who seem superannuated, are left at rest.’ ‘ Yes,’ replied Miss ———, inadvertently, ‘ the old ones are good for nothing.’

“ This abrupt unlucky expression proved a finishing stroke to our talk : a general smile was observed throughout the room, at which Mrs. ——— thought it proper to rise. In continuing our course through the building, we were accompanied by the young nun and several old ones, who all seemed willing to converse, and were much more affable than I could have supposed, by judging from general accounts of monastic manners.”

My correspondent found out, and communicated to me, the name and rank of the young nun who interested him so much ; but I forbear giving particulars, lest they should meet the eye, and give pain to some of her relations, seeing my work is finding its way into very remote parts of the world. Suffice it to say, that she had voluntarily forsaken her father’s house, where she enjoyed all the gaieties which this world can afford, that she might be immured for life within the walls of a nunnery.

Some of my readers may, perhaps, be disposed to reckon this a very innocent and happy life ; and my correspondent will be understood as giving a most favourable view of Popery. For my own part, without intending any thing particular in the conduct of the Canadian sisterhood, I have no hesitation in pronouncing the life of a nun, as well as that of a monk, a wicked and a miserable one. God has not required either men or women to seclude themselves from the world in this manner ; and as the thing originated with the prince of darkness, it would be easy to show that the fruit has been an abundance of the works of darkness. But on this subject I do not choose to enter farther at present.

THE
Protestant,

No. LXXIV.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 11th, 1819.

FOR the following letter I am indebted to a gentleman who is personally known to me, and who has seen a good deal of Ireland. His narrative confirms what I have already related of certain Popish superstitions which are practised in that kingdom; and it contains besides, some original matter, which will, I think, be interesting to the reader:—

“ TO THE PROTESTANT.

“ SIR,

“ In confirmation of much that you have advanced in “ THE PROTESTANT,” on the subject of consecrated wells, the gross ignorance of the Catholic population of Ireland, and of the priests professing to forgive sins, I beg leave to mention to you some particulars of a visit which I paid to that country, in the year 1812, every circumstance of which is founded in truth. Educated as a member of the church of Scotland, and having never till then had any connexion with Roman Catholics, their faith had not become an object of much attention to me. Early did I hear that their church was described in the Apocalypse; and in advancing years I was convinced, that it was the “ Man of sin,” mentioned by the apostle Paul, in one of his epistles to the Thessalonians. Farther, I thought little about the Church of Rome, or her members, except sometimes indulging a feeling of pity that so large a portion of Europe, was enveloped in such thick darkness.

“ I arrived in Dublin about the middle of June, and soon heard that an immense collection of people were to assemble on the eve of St. John’s day, the 24th of that month, to receive absolution from their ghostly fathers, for penances performed at certain wells

near that city, or for observing other ceremonies. I was at first incredulous; but, as the distance was not more than two miles, I was induced to go and see what was to take place.

"We arrived at a large field, which either was, or had been, a burying ground, as certain rude pillars, and some grave stones, sufficiently demonstrated. In the middle of the field was a rising ground, and on one of the slopes, was pitched a great number of tents, in which were persons of both sexes, dancing, drinking, and singing. It occurred to me at once,—Can this be a religious ceremony? Are these persons in deep contrition for their sins? or are not these the orgies of some heathen deity? I was instantly roused, at ideas so incongruous to all devotional feeling; and with some dread, I confess, I approached and entered some of the tents, to inspect more narrowly this strange thing "Catholicity," as it is now called. I very soon found that, though a heretic, I was a welcome visitor, and that the amusements in that quarter were any thing but of a serious cast. Prompted by increasing curiosity, I perambulated the immense field, where many thousands of both sexes were collected, and at last I reached the sacred well. Around this were assembled a vast multitude of men and women, hawking sweet-meats, toys, ballads, &c. many girls, well advanced, half naked, and young children, many of whom were held down under a pretty strong cascade of water, by their older friends or relations; and this appeared to be the *penance* part of the field, for the girls were, to appearance, very much disinclined to endure the cold bath. They were frequently encouraged by the deaconesses, as I termed them, to endure a little longer, and the appointment of the priest would be completed. I was not at first inclined to approach nearer; but, by this time, finding my curiosity and boldness increase, and happening to be dressed in black, I repeated these fantastic words in Latin, "*Ar-tium societatus socius.*" Instantly a call was made, to allow his reverence to get nearer the holy well. So much for the use of a dead language, in reference to their religious ceremonies. Here I was kindly offered a drink of this absolvent water; but as I was not accustomed to assume the sacred character, I deemed it proper to make my escape from such company as quickly as possible. I afterwards learned that many miracles had been performed that evening, by the cure of diseases at this well. In ordinary cases, a church yard is calculated to excite solemn feelings. Here it was quite otherwise; and that not in an obscure corner of the province of Conaught, or among the wild Irish, improperly, I confess, so called, but within two or three miles of the capital of Ireland!

"From particular circumstances, I afterwards became connected for a time, with Roman Catholics of some consequence in that

kingdom. It is not to be expected that I should divulge confidential matters in any shape ; but I will mention, that business led me to the county of Galway. Travelling in a post chaise, I arrived at the Abbey, or Monastery, I know not which, of —. This being partly in ruins, but being fine ones, I was requested by the driver to alight, and proceed a little off the road to take a view of them. I did so, and knocking at a gate, I was admitted by a female, who very politely told me that the proprietor was absent, which he would lament, as he was partial to travellers, and was acquainted with the present Pope ; but that she would be happy to show me the buildings. One part of them, I found, was devoted to a chapel ; and behind, within the walls, was a burying place. My attention was instantly arrested by a vast quantity of human skulls, and other bones, which lay above ground, and which seemed to have been recently disinterred. On inquiring the reason of this, my conductress was at first a little shy in giving an answer, but at last she told me, it had been done by the vulgar in quest of relics. Proceeding to another section of the building, I was still more astonished to find thousands of human skulls, packed up precisely as bottled liquor is, in the catacombs of a wine cellar ; and they appeared very much whitened, as I supposed by long exposure to the weather. I inquired what these were ? “ These, Sir,” said my informant, “ are the bones of the faithful, slain at the time your countryman, King William, visited Ireland.” Let the advocates of emancipation attend to this circumstance. This solemn “ *memento mori*” is not kept above ground, and in the view of the “ *faithful*,” of the present day, for nothing.

“ Leaving the Abbey, I could not but reflect how it was that the proprietor, who I understand had seen much of the world, and was well educated, could allow his neighbours to wander here in search of relics, which are of no more use than the bones of a dead horse lying by the road-side ? and why he suffered these bones, after having been dug up, to remain unburied ?

“ Proceeding to Galway, the same evening, I fell in with a very uncommon person, even one who traced up distinctly his pedigree to one of the ancient families of this county, who had been deprived of their estates during the troubles of Ireland, about two hundred years ago. He described the estates, gave the names of the present proprietors, and frequently said, that, under a new order of things, they would revert to him and his heirs as a matter of right. He often mentioned the name of King William the Third with strong terms of reprobation. Politeness in the party, who, with exception of himself, were all Protestants, made them only at first hint their dissent from his opinions. His warmth became greater, and his avowed abhorrence of King William, and of all Englishmen, only increased by our moderation ; and the most violent expressions

escaped him. At last he was reminded that the Union had a tendency to make us all brethren; and that old quarrels should be forgotten, that one mind might animate the inhabitants of the three kingdoms; but this had no effect upon him. He having declared his firm adherence to the Catholic faith, I asked him, "Do you know any thing of the fifth commandment; that is our sixth, Thou shalt not kill?" To my surprise, he instantly fell on his knees to me, and kissing my hand, declared that he now knew I was a priest, and begged I would go home with him, and hear the confessions of himself, his wife, and family, as it had been delayed too long. I begged him to rise, assuring him that I was a sinner like himself, and not a priest; but he only became the more importunate, and I was forced to leave the place. Previously to this, I had mentioned what I had seen at the Monastery; and I asked him, if he had ever seen such a collection of human bones at any other place in Galway? He said he had, about two years ago; but that the Apostles, Peter and Paul, accompanied by the Virgin Mary, had lately come down, and buried them all in one night!

"I became intimate with a gentleman, a Catholic, of no ordinary talents, finely educated on every subject of literature and philosophy, and a man of very just thinking on matters of business; but sadly prejudiced on matters of religion. I was led, from certain circumstances, to suppose that he had been originally intended for the priesthood. At all events he had received his education among the Jesuits. Seeing me frequently at chapel, he had, I suppose, formed a favourable opinion of me, and he proposed to make me an *honorary Catholic*, as he termed it. This I did not well understand; but said I had no objection to become Catholic if he could remove certain difficulties; and hoped that if I could remove his, he would become Protestant; but he did not very frankly acquiesce in this stipulation. I told him my difficulties were the invocation of saints, praying to the Virgin Mary, transubstantiation, auricular confession, and forgiveness of sins by the priests. Notwithstanding my quoting the standards of their church as used in Ireland, he denied the invocation of saints, and prayers to the Virgin Mary; but admitted transubstantiation, and the remission of sins by the priests. I put the question very strongly, seeing we are all fallible creatures, suppose a priest should commit sin, to whom does he confess? who forgives him? My new acquaintance became ghastly and breathless; and after a pause of a few moments, he replied, "They confess to one another every Saturday, and are absolved." "If," said I, "it is a doctrine of your church, that a sinful man can pardon a sinful man, I shall not become a Catholic." Here the matter ended.

"In Ireland I often heard the Catholics speak as if they were quite confident that we, and all their strayed brethren, would return to the true church, as they style theirs. Look, say they, at the Manichean Schism, more extensive in its effects, and of longer duration than your churches of Germany and England, and where is it now? I am, &c.

A. O."

The following relates to Popish superstitions nearer home, even in the midst of Protestant Scotland. The writer has given me his name, which is indispensable in communications which relate to matters of fact; and I have no hesitation in saying that the statement may be relied on, as strictly true in every particular

" TO THE PROTESTANT.

" SIR,

As connected with a late number of your seasonable and informing paper, I beg leave to send you some particulars of which I myself have been an eye and ear-witness. They go to prove that Popery, like the house infected with the plague of leprosy, works secretly in minds once tainted with it, unless eradicated thence by the knowledge and love of divine truth. It is a system that cannot be ameliorated, and therefore the Scriptures denounce its total destruction, without sparing a foundation or corner stone. A liberal education, and intercourse with Protestants, may conceal or disguise its turpitude, and soften its asperities; but those who see its native deformity and tendency, and do not exert themselves to rescue the lower orders from so dire a pest—how dwells the love of God, and of mankind, in them?

"Your correspondent once visited that famed place, St. Fillan's seat, at a time when the waters there were reputed to possess the virtues of Siloam's pool of old. The extraordinary virtue of curing lunacy, and even raving madness, and other plagues incident to man, is thought to be derived to the place at the commencement of four terms of the year, from the once residence there of the Saint that gives it name, of whom wonderful things are told. When a worthy Protestant minister was fixed there whom we have once heard preach in this city, and who favoured his countrymen with their present version of the New Testament in Scotch Gaelic, he thought it his duty to preach against the superstition practised on such occasions. His life was threatened, if he did not desist, and some of his cattle are said to have been injured. The rites then practised, which were continued from time immemorial, brought gain to the village, the fear of losing which aroused the people's zeal, as in the case of the damsel at Philippi. After performing various rites and immersions, all thought necessary to complete the process, the patient was bound,

hand and foot, to two planks fixed length-ways to the ground, amidst the ruins of a Popish chapel, and there left to pass the night. If found loosed from his bandages, by what was thought to be some supernatural agency, this was construed as an omen or pledge of the patient's recovery.

"But permit me to be a little more particular. The afflicted person, when he came to understand what his keepers had in view, he earnestly begged they would not perform such foolish things, or expect any advantage from them. An old man who attended for the purpose, who probably was once a Romish Priest, but now acted as a teacher in the village, conducted all the ceremonies, and fluently expatiated on their origin and virtues. He carried the patient so many times across the ford of a river, and round so many cairns of stones, requiring him to throw one each time into the heap, raised probably in course of time by this means. With the stone was thrown some part of the patient's clothes, the pedagogue probably adding, as usual in such cases, some spell or charm.

"This ceremony over, which took some time, he was guarded to a pool of the same river, ordered to strip and wade into the deep part, and if reluctant, repeatedly immersed over head, and forcibly kept some time under water, while violently struggling, as if alarmed for his life. Females were equally welcome to witness the exhibition in the state of nature as the males, and all lent a hand to overawe and subdue the poor patient.—This pool was supposed to have all the virtue ascribed to it from a grey stone, once in possession of the Saint, and ordered, before his death, to be cast into this pool, where, however, it is now invisible. Long it was famous, even after his death, for giving speedy delivery to women in hard child-labour, and for other distresses, and often sent for, from a great distance to answer such purposes, and greatly relied on in such cases. The virtue of this consecrated stone did not die with the famed Saint, and is supposed to continue periodically in the pool into which it was thrown, at least so far as respects the removal of certain ailments. In vain you ask any questions, you must implicitly receive whatever they hand down from tradition.

"The patient having got dressed, he is conducted next to the side of an adjacent hill, to drink copious draughts from a well, dedicated to some saint. Here the company pledge him, all expecting some benefit from the libations of this holy water. It escapes me whether this did not constitute the last ceremony, or was not preceded by what follows; whether, from this salutiferous fountain, he was not carried to the burial place, where a new place of worship was built, bordering on the ruins of the old Romish chapel. There the patient is made to sit down on a grave stone, on which lay a large hand bell, which is repeatedly rung over his head by the master of the ceremonies, and he is as

often crowned with it ; all the while money passes from hand to hand, and finally lodges with him, which is deemed a necessary part of this and of all the preceding rites. The pedagogue entertains you all the while, with the miraculous feats of this wonder-working bell, the spectators assenting to the truth of the whole. One of these was, that upon a time some wicked wretch stole it, and carried it all the way to Glasgow, whence it was soon heard returning, ringing all the way in the air, till it alighted on that grave stone where it then lay, to the astonishment of all beholders. These things were as firmly believed, and as gravely told, as if an angel had confirmed them from heaven ; and they find professed Protestants silly enough to give them credit, I suppose, even to this day. By such vain stories is the reputation of this place of resort, all along maintained, so that to call them in question, would endanger any man's safety who visits these bounds.—With great gravity they related a circumstance, which should have happened some time before, and greatly added to the reputation of this wonder-working place. Some man passing in his way to a public market, was heard to ridicule the virtue of the place, as merely delusion, and superstition. To be avenged for such profanation, he ran raving mad in the market, and was obliged to be carried back bound, to the very place which he had dared, so impudently, to ridicule. When professed Protestants are so silly as to expect relief from such rites, and to secure them at the cost of much labour and expense, no wonder they are credulous enough to give credit to such tales.

“ The poor passive patient is now conducted to the dreary ruins of the Popish chapel, overgrown with nettles and other weeds, and there bound down firmly with a tether, between the two sides of an old car, with no covering but the heavens, and left thus to pass a long night in sadness and sorrow. The youth who was the subject of this painful operation, having a sense of piety on his mind, was desired to pray, before he was bound down among the prostrate dead. I can never forget one part of his solemn address, in which he expressed his abhorrence of these unhallowed rites, and appealed to God, that his compliance with them was the sole result of compulsion, and that he expected deliverance from quite another quarter.

“ Thus have I given you a brief view of this infernal ceremony, so often practised even in highly favoured Scotland. Is it not surprising that any can think lightly of the crime of idolatry, so wicked in its origin, and so fatally degrading in its influence, who have access to know what punishment God inflicted on the Jews for the commission of it, and continues to inflict to this day.

“ I am, Sir,

“ A CONSTANT READER.”

I shall conclude my miscellaneous matter for the present, by quoting a writer in the *Orthodox Journal*, for September last, who has pointed out the most effectual means of affording relief to our starving population. No plan so simple, and at the same time so likely to be effectual, has been suggested by any other author. The writer is a zealous Papist. He speaks of emancipation as if he despaired of obtaining it. He is for petitioning only *once more*; and in the event of the prayer of the petition being refused, which he considers almost certain, he calls upon his *five millions* of brethren to remove, bag and baggage, to Spain, that free and happy country, where he is almost sure the beloved Ferdinand will be most happy to receive them. Let this sublime measure be carried into effect, and there will be employment and provision enough in Britain and Ireland, for those who remain.

"We cannot," says this writer, "we cannot longer hug our misery, or slavishly embrace intolerable chains. Our bondage is more cruel than any death, and continued for ages. We are entirely wearied out under insupportable burdens, and galled to the heart by constant disappointments, in vain expectations. Another failure will show that our countrymen are also wearied of us, and that a separation must take place. We must then go into voluntary banishment. I mean not to America, the Cape of Good Hope, or New South Wales, whither, as we have much reason to fear, all our chains would follow us. *Faithful Spain* offers the fairest prospects to our view, where loving brethren, with stretched-out arms, are ready to receive us into their kind embraces. That kingdom was very much depopulated, even before the late destructive war, which completed its desolation, and left one fourth of that fine country a perfect desert."

"Five millions of good subjects," continues this writer, "is truly a grand object to Spain in its present situation."—"Should our first applications (*i. e.* for emancipation) fail, be you ready, Mr. ANDREWS, to sound the trumpet of emigration. Let the peals of it, like thunder, be heard over all the British dominions, calling our people together."—"In the event of our being forced to emigrate, which is but too probable, from all the past obstinate resistance of our just claims, I wish you would induce some of your correspondents, who may have poetical talents, to compose a hymn appropriate to the occasion, upon the words, *In exitu Israel de Egypto*, and the rest of the first verse of that psalm. I am for committing the care of the tabernacle, in this holy transmigration, to the eminent MILNER."—"Sir James Gordon will conduct the Scots."

The writer is not in jest, but in sober earnest; and I do most cordially wish him, and DR. MILNER, and Sir James Gordon, success in this "holy transmigration."

THE

Protestant,

No. LXXV.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 18th, 1819.

It is time now to take up the solemn subject of Purgatory which, in my sixty-ninth Number, I announced as the next general head of the plan which I had proposed to myself. As a suitable introduction to a subject of such importance, I quote the following anecdote from the *Philanthropic Gazette*, of the 27th October last, for the truth of which the Editor of that truly valuable Journal is responsible.

“A gentleman in Dublin lately called on a tenant for rent; the poor woman had been always punctual heretofore; she apologized for not being so now, by telling her landlord, that the priest came to her lately, and asked her if she had heard from her husband? She answered, how could she, as he was dead? ‘Oh! yes,’ said he, ‘but did you not hear that a great crowd was lately passing over *the bridge from Purgatory to heaven*; that it broke down from the weight; that many were left at the wrong side, and amongst the rest your husband; that their lamentations had come to the priests to get the bridge repaired; therefore, he called upon her, who was so much interested, for a good subscription, as the job would be very expensive! The poor woman complied of course. In a few days after, the gentleman brought this nefarious traffic to exposure; the priest declared he only wanted the use of the money for a few days, and played this trick to obtain it, but that he meant to return it.”

I will concede to my opponents that this anecdote is not taken from one of their own authors. It is, indeed, given as a fact in a highly respectable Newspaper; it is said to have taken place *lately* in Dublin; and as there are thousands of Papists in that city, where my work is republished in weekly Numbers, they will not only soon have an opportunity of reading the story, but

they may, if they please, enquire into the truth of it. If it shall not be contradicted, or even questioned by those who have an opportunity of ascertaining the fact, I will consider its truth as admitted; and if so, it shows to what pitiful arts the holy fathers of Rome have recourse in order to rob people of their money.

I shall not, however, found any argument upon this anecdote, even supposing it to be true, but shall, according to my usual practice, lay down the doctrine of the church of Rome in the words of her own accredited publications, and then proceed to show that it is contrary to Scripture and to common sense.

Purgatory, it must be confessed, makes no great figure in the Douay Catechism. Instead of giving it the honour of a chapter by itself, as a doctrine of such importance deserves, the compilers, as if afraid of exposing it to the light in this enlightened country, have thrust it into a corner of a chapter which bears the title of "the kinds of sin expounded."

"Q. Whither go such as die in mortal sin? A. To hell to all eternity. Q. Whither go such as die in venial sin, or not having fully satisfied for the punishment due to their mortal sins? A. To purgatory, till they have made full satisfaction for them, and then to heaven. Q. What proof have you of this in the New Testament? A. First from our Saviour's own words, Matt. xii. 32. where, speaking of the remission of sins, he says, there is one that will not be forgiven in this world nor in the world to come: which words, St. Austin says, would not be true, if some sins were not forgiven in the next world; and this implies a purgatory, for there only is remission of sin, and not in hell or in heaven. Second, From St. Paul, 1 Cor. iii. 15, where he speaks of some, under the guilt of sin, that shall be saved, *yet so as by fire.*"

This is all that the Douay Catechism teaches concerning purgatory; and, I think, it will be allowed that here there are some great and fundamental errors. The first that strikes us is that which makes a distinction between mortal and venial sin. From the word of God we learn that sin, and that every sin, without exception, is the object of divine abhorrence; and that the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against *all* unrighteousness, and all ungodliness of men, without any exception. In the whole Bible, there is no such thing as a small or venial sin mentioned, or alluded to. It is declared that he who offendeth in one point is a transgressor of the whole law, because the single transgression, however trivial the matter may appear to men, indicates a state of mind in the offender, which is opposed to the authority of the Lawgiver; and is, therefore, opposed to every precept of the law itself. I allude at present to this subject only

in general terms, it may come afterwards more formally in our way, as a distinct subject of discussion.

Another fundamental error plainly avowed by the Douay doctors in the above extract, is, that men must make full satisfaction to divine justice, even for their mortal sins, or they must go "to hell for all eternity." It is supposed that some persons die who have not "fully satisfied for the punishment due to their mortal sins;" and these go "to purgatory, till they have made full satisfaction for them." I believe it is not possible in fewer words, to set aside altogether the atonement of Christ. It was declared of him that he should finish transgression, make an end of sin, make reconciliation for iniquity, and bring in everlasting righteousness, Dan. ix. 24. When he appeared in the likeness of sinful flesh, it was to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. Heb. ix. 26. His death was an atoning sacrifice for sin. Heb. x. 12. and it is declared that by him we receive the atonement, or reconciliation. Rom. v. 11. He only was able to make satisfaction for the sins of his people, and he alone has done it: the sinner, believing in him, receives the atonement; he sees that satisfaction has been made for his sins by the death of Christ: thus he enjoys peace with God, and the assurance of his favour; and he knows that he is no more able to make full, or even partial satisfaction for his sins, than he is to create a world.

But the Douay Catechism teaches that every individual must make full satisfaction for his sins, either in this world, or in a certain fancied middle state which they call Purgatory. According to this doctrine, Christ has done nothing for them in the way of satisfaction or atonement, for they must do all for themselves. This, therefore, is the Antichrist, which sets aside the doctrine of Christ, and salvation through him alone. In comparison of this, their baptism of bells, and all their other mummary, are harmless, and not worthy to be named. This subverts the whole system of divine revelation, and brings Popery down to the level of the grossest heathenism. It is a religion without a Saviour; which leaves every man to satisfy divine justice for himself; and is, therefore, no better than that of Mahomet, or of the Grand Lama of Thibet.

The above are some of the fundamental errors of the Douay Catechism relating to Purgatory. I shall reply to what they adduce as scriptural authority for their doctrine, after I have given the doctrine itself more in detail, and that from their own acknowledged publications. The following is from "The Grounds of the Catholic Doctrine, contained in the Profession of Faith, published by Pope Pius the Fourth, by way of question and answer."

“ OF PURGATORY.

“ Q. What is the doctrine of the church as to this point ?

“ A. We constantly hold that there is a Purgatory, and that the souls therein detained are helped by the suffrages of the faithful : that is, by the prayers and alms offered for them, and principally by the holy sacrifice of the Mass.

“ Q. What do you mean by Purgatory ?

“ A. A middle state of souls which depart this life in God’s grace, yet not without some lesser stains or guilt of punishment, which retards them from entering heaven. But as to the particular place where these souls suffer, or the quality of the torments which they suffer, the church has decided nothing.

“ What sort of Christians then go to Purgatory ?

“ A. 1st, Such as die guilty of lesser sins, which we commonly call *venial* ; as many Christians do, who, either by sudden death, or otherwise, are taken out of this life before they have repented for these ordinary failings. 2dly, Such, as having been formerly guilty of greater sins, have not made full satisfaction for them to divine justice.

“ Q. Why do you say that those who die guilty of lesser sins go to Purgatory ?

“ A. Because such as depart this life before they have repented of these venial frailties and imperfections, cannot be supposed to be condemned to the eternal torments of hell, since the sins of which they are guilty are *but small*, which even God’s best servants are liable to. Nor can they go straight to heaven in this state, because the Scriptures assure us, Rev. xxi. 27. There shall in no wise enter thither any thing that defileth. Now every sin, be it ever so small, certainly defileth the soul. Hence our Saviour assures us that we are to give an account for every idle word. Mat. xii. 36.”

The above is a plain statement of the doctrine of Purgatory, as laid down by authority of Pope Pius the Fourth. There is then an attempt to prove the doctrine from “ Scripture, Tradition, and Reason.” I shall examine His Holiness’ Scriptural proofs by and bye ; those from tradition are scarcely worth examining ; and as the argument from reason is comprehended in the answer to one question, I shall give it here, and trust to the reason of every Protestant reader to furnish a sufficient answer.

“ Q. How do you ground the belief of Purgatory upon reason ?

“ A. Because reason clearly teaches those two things : 1st, That all and every sin, how small soever, deserves punishment : 2dly, That some sins are *so small*, either through the levity of the matter, or for want of full deliberation in the actor, as not to

deserve eternal punishment. From whence it is plain, that besides the place of eternal punishment, which we call hell, there must be also a place of temporal punishment, for such as die in *little sins*, and this we call Purgatory."

Mr. Gother, who is an oracle among modern Papists, in his work entitled, "*The Papist Misrepresented and Represented*," writes thus of his true *Papist*, for it did not occur to him that this was a term of reproach, or that his sect had an exclusive right to the term "*Catholic*:"—"His reason convinces him that there must be some third place, for, since the infinite goodness of God can admit nothing into heaven which is not clean, and pure from all sin, both great and small; and his infinite justice can permit none to receive the reward of bliss, who, as yet, are not out of debt, but have something in justice to suffer; there must of necessity be some place or state, where souls departing this life, pardoned as to the eternal guilt or pain, yet obnoxious to some temporal penalty, or with the guilt of some venial faults, are purged and purified before their admittance into heaven. And this is what he is taught concerning purgatory; which, though he knows not where it is, of what nature the pains are, or how long each soul is detained there; yet he believes, that those that are in this place, being the living members of Jesus Christ, are relieved by the prayers of their fellow members here on earth, as also by alms and masses, offered up to God for their souls. And as for such as have no relations or friends to pray for them, or give alms, or procure masses for their relief, they are not neglected by the church, which makes a general commemoration of all the faithful departed in every mass, and in every one of the canonical hours of the divine office."

So much for the oracle of our English Papists. Let us hear now what another great author says, namely Alexander Natalis, (In Dissert. § 4. Dissert. 41. p. 352.) He distinguishes what is of faith in this matter and what not, and thus resolves, "That it does not at all belong to faith, 1st, Concerning the place, whether it be in this world, or upon earth, or in the dark air, where the devils are; or in the hell of the damned; or in some place underneath, nearer the earth, that the souls are purged. 2dly, Concerning the quality of those sensible pains which the souls held in purgatory undergo; whether it be true or corporeal fire, or whether darkness and sorrow, or any other torment and sorrow inflicted by the justice of God, punishing them after a wonderful and yet true manner. 3dly, Concerning the duration of these purgatory pains, how long the souls are detained there. or though SOTO thought that no soul continued in purgatory above ten years, yet it is a matter altogether uncertain, how many years those pains shall last." See *Preservative against Popery*, Title viii. cap. vi. page 116.

Though the above learned writer does not pretend to say what sort of pains they are, which are suffered in purgatory, the Catechism set out by order of the council of Trent, determines concerning the pains themselves, that they are caused by fire. "There is," says *Catechismus ad Parochos*, "a purgatory fire, in which the souls of the faithful being tormented for a certain time, are expiated; that so a passage may be opened for them into the eternal country, into which no defiled thing can enter." *Part i. Art. v. Sect. 5.*

The holy and angelic doctor, St. Thomas Aquinas, is yet more explicit. He tells us "not only that it is fire, in which the souls are tormented, but that it is the very *same fire* that torments the damned in hell, and the just in purgatory. And Bel-larmine himself confesses, that almost all their divines teach, that the damned, and the souls in purgatory, are tormented in the same fire, and in the same place." *Preservative, &c. as above, in which the works are referred to.*

But I shall ascend as usual to the highest authority. I am so happy as to be in the possession of an authentic edition of the canons of the council of Trent, printed at Antwerp, 1677. As the work is in few hands, I shall give the very words of that high ecumenical council, with a literal translation, by which my readers will be made acquainted with the genuine infallible doctrine of the church of Rome on this subject.

SESSIO XXV.

QUÆ EST NONA ET ULTIMA,

SUB PIO IV. PONT. MAX. CÆPTA DIE III. ABSOLUTA DIE IV. DECEM.

M. D. LXIII.

Decretum de Purgatorio.

CUM Catholica Ecclesia, Spiritu Sancto edocta, ex sacris literis, et antiqua Patrum traditione, in sacris Conciliis, et novissimè in hac œcumenica Synodo docuerit. (a) Purgatorium esse; animasque ibi detentas, fidelium suffragiis, potissimum verò acceptabili altaris sacrificio juvari præcipit sancta Synodus Episcopis, ut sanam de Purgatorio doctrinam, (b) à sanctis Patribus (c) et sacris Conciliis traditam, à Christi fidelibus credi, teneri, doceri, et ubique prædicari diligenter studeant. Apud rudem verò plebem difficiliores ac subtiliores quæstiones, (d) quæque ad ædificationem non faciunt, et ex quibus plerumque nulla fit pietatis accessio, à popularibus concionibus secludantur. (e) Incerta item, vel quæ

(a) Sup. Sess. 6. Can. 30. et Sess. 22. cap. 2. et Can. 3. (b) c. Qualis, et seq. Dist. 25. (c) Conc. Floren. Ses. ult. in fin. (d) 1 Tim. 1. (e) Council. Later. Sub Leone X.

specie falsi laborant, evulgari ac tractari non permittant. Ea vero quæ ad curiositatem quamdam aut superstitionem spectant, vel turpe lucrum sapiunt, tamquam scandala et fidelium offendicula prohibeant. (f) Current autem Episcopi, ut fidelium vivorum suffragia, Missarum scilicet sacrificia, orationes, eleemosynæ, aliaque pietatis opera, quæ à fidelibus pro aliis fidelibus defunctis fieri consueverunt, secundùm Ecclesiæ instituta piè et devotè fiant; et quæ pro illis ex testatorum foundationibus, vel alia ratione debentur, non perfunctoriè, sed à sacerdotibus, et Ecclesiæ ministris, et aliis, qui hoc præstare tenentur, diligenter et accuratè persolvantur."

COUNCIL OF TRENT, SESSION 25th,

BEING THE NINTH AND LAST UNDER PIUS IV. BEGUN

ON THE 3d, AND ENDED ON THE 4th DECEMBER,

1563.

Decree concerning Purgatory.

"As the Catholic Church, instructed by the Holy Spirit, from the sacred writings, and the ancient tradition of the Fathers, hath taught in its sacred councils, and lastly, in this Œcumenical Synod, that there is a purgatory, and that the souls there confined are relieved by the suffrages of the faithful, but more especially by the acceptable sacrifice of the altar; the holy Synod instructs the bishops, that they should pay attention, that the sound doctrine concerning purgatory, as delivered by the holy fathers, and the sacred councils, be, by the faithful in Christ, believed, held, taught, and every where diligently preached. But that among uninformed people, the more difficult and subtle questions, which tend not to edification, and from which, there is in general no increase of piety, be excluded from all popular addresses. Also, that they do not allow doubtful matters, or such as labour under the appearance of falsity to be talked of and discussed. But that they prohibit those things which have reference only to a certain curiosity or superstition, or which savour of filthy lucre, as scandals and causes of some offence to the faithful. But let the bishops take care, that the suffrages of the faithful who are alive, namely, the sacrifices of the mass, orations, acts of charity, and other pious deeds, which it has been customary for the faithful to perform on behalf of the other faithful who are dead, should be piously and devoutly performed according to the institutions of the church; and that those (*religious services*) which may be owing on the behalf of such, to the legacies of testators, or on any

(f) Infr. cap. 4. de ref.

other account, be, by the priests, ministers of the church, and others, whose duty it is to perform those matters not slightly, but diligently and accurately discharged."

I return now to my first authority above cited, to wit, the Douay Catechism; and I shall begin with some remarks on the passages of Scripture, which are alleged in support of the doctrine of purgatory. The first is, Mat. xii. 32. "*There is a sin that will not be forgiven in this world, nor in the world to come.*" From this the grave doctors introduce St. Augustine, as arguing, that there must be some sins which are forgiven in the world to come, and as there is no forgiveness in heaven or hell, it must be in Purgatory. Great men, we see, can draw great conclusions from very slight premises. Men of ordinary capacity could never find out, from the declaration, that there is one sin which shall not be forgiven in this world or the next; that there are many sins which shall be forgiven in the world to come; and that there is a place for the purpose, which belongs to neither this world nor the next; but, which hangs between the two, like Mahomet's coffin, between the earth and heaven.

Our Lord's words evidently mean no more, than that for the sin in question, there was no forgiveness, either here or hereafter. The words as recorded by Mark are, "He that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost, hath *never* forgiveness," chap. iii. 29. According to Luke xii. 10. it is simply, he shall not be forgiven. What stronger expressions could be used, than shall *not*, shall *never* be forgiven? But this has no connexion with the subject of Purgatory, unless it be taken as a general declaration, that sins which are not forgiven in this world, shall not be forgiven at all, and then it overthrows the doctrine of purgatory altogether.

In Jewish phraseology, the expression, "world to come," signified the kingdom, or reign of the Messiah. It is under this that we live. The church is under a very different sort of administration from that of the Old Covenant. The Jews expected a great change when the Messiah should come; but he told them that the sin against the Holy Ghost should not be forgiven under the future, any more than under the present, administration of his kingdom; which is, indeed, as much as to say, it shall not be forgiven for ever.

Want of room obliges to defer a farther exposure of the weakness of the proof of Purgatory from Scripture. The subject will come before us again

THE

Protestant,

No. LXXVI.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 25th, 1819.

MY last Number broke off in the middle of my reply to what the Douay Doctors give as Scripture authority, for their doctrine concerning purgatory. They argue, that there is one sin of which it is declared, it shall not be forgiven in the world to come ; therefore, other sins shall be forgiven in the future world. I have already shown that the conclusion is not contained in the premises ; but though it were, it would have nothing to do with purgatory, which is not a place of forgiveness, but a place of punishment. Sins which are forgiven are not punished ; and sins which are punished are not forgiven. On this subject I cannot express myself better than in the nervous language of Archbishop Wake :—

“ But what have we here to do with the remission of sins ? Purgatory is a place, not where sins are remitted, but where they are punished with the greatest severity ; nay, what is still more, punished after they are remitted ; nay, what is still more extraordinary, therefore punished because they are remitted. For if the guilt were not remitted, the sinner could not go to purgatory, nor have the favour of being punished there. And therefore it is utterly impertinent, from the remission of some sins in the world to come, to conclude, that there is a place where all sins, even the least, are exacted ; and that so rigidly, that there is no escaping thence, till either by themselves, or their friends, they have paid the very *uttermost farthing*.” *Preservative, &c. Tit. viii. page 120.*

The next Scripture authority which the Douay Doctors bring forward in support of their purgatory, is 1 Cor. iii. 15. “ Saved so as by fire.” Let any man of ordinary understanding read the entire passage, and he will see that it does not contain the most

distant allusion to a middle state between this world and the next. Besides, it is not said that a ~~man~~ shall be saved *by fire*; but *so* as by fire. The Apostle had been speaking of metals. Fire is the instrument by which these are tried, and purified, and separated from things of a gross and more perishable nature. Now, if any Christian were to lose sight of the foundation of his hope, or so far forget the character of that foundation, as to build improper things upon it, God would, by some trying dispensation, destroy his work. He would suffer the loss of all his labour; and so, *as by fire* the dross is separated from the gold, he would be separated and saved from his errors and corruptions. Whether this will be considered a satisfactory view of a difficult passage, I cannot tell, but it seems very evident that it has nothing to do with purgatory.

These are all the passages of Scripture which the Douay Catechism adduces in support of purgatory. In other Popish books, there are many other passages wrested from their true meaning, in order to prop up this profitable piece of imposition, some of which may come to be discussed before I have done with the subject.

Some of the errors of the church of Rome are mere novelties; others are of more ancient date. Transubstantiation belongs to the former, as it was not publicly acknowledged as a doctrine of the church, till some ages after the tenth century, which has been called the age of lead; but the doctrine of purgatory is of much greater antiquity: and it will not be difficult to shew, that it is more ancient than Christianity itself, meaning, by Christianity, the New Testament dispensation; though, properly speaking, Christianity is as old as the creation, at least as old as the promise of God to Adam and Eve, that the seed of the woman should bruise the head of the serpent.

Papists lay great stress upon the antiquity of their doctrines and practices; and we must allow that they have antiquity to plead on behalf of their purgatory. When captious Papists have asked us, "Where was your religion before Luther?" we have been accustomed to reply, "In the New Testament;" and this is the truth: and when we ask of Papists, "Where was your purgatory, before Gregory the Great?" they can tell us, if they please, and tell us truly,—"In the writings of heathen poets and philosophers." These are the worthy ancestors of modern, and indeed of ancient Papists; and Cardinal Bellarmine (*Bellarm. de Purgat. lib. i. cap. 11.*) founds an argument on behalf of purgatory upon this very circumstance, that the ancient heathens believed in it; for then, he thinks, it must have been a dictate of right reason; but if the opinions of heathen philosophers are to be re-

ceived as of authority in this matter ; if we must take our notions of Christianity from such teachers, we will soon find ourselves led far enough away from the simplicity of the gospel. We will find that the worship of images, and that every sort of abomination is consistent with right reason, because it has the countenance of some heathen poet or philosopher.

Eusebius relates of Plato, that he divided mankind into three states ; some, who, having purified themselves by philosophy, and excelled in holiness of life, enjoy an eternal felicity in the islands of the blest, without any labour or trouble, which neither is it possible for any words to express, nor any thoughts to conceive. Others, that having lived exceedingly wicked, and therefore seemed incapable of cure, he supposed were at their death thrown down headlong into hell, there to be tormented for ever. But now, besides these, he imagined there were a middle sort, who, though they had sinned, yet had repented of it, and therefore seemed to be in a curable condition ; and these, he thought, went down for some time to hell too, to be purged and absolved by grievous torments : but that after that, they should be delivered from it, and attain to honours according to the dignity of their benefactors. *See Archbishop Wake's Discourse on Purgatory, with the reference to Eusebius Præparat. Evangel. lib. ii. cap. 38.*

“ The heathens undoubtedly supposed that those who were in this middle state, might receive help from the prayers and sacrifices of the living. This is evident, from the complaints of the ghosts of Elpenor in Homer, and of Palinurus in Virgil, (in *Odyss. lib. xii.* and in *Æneid, lib. vi.*) And indeed the ceremonies used for their deliverance, as described by those poets, so nearly resemble the practice of the present Roman church, that were but these poems *canonical*, it would be in vain for the most obstinate heretic to contend with them.”

“ It must then be confessed,” says Archbishop Wake, “ that our adversaries, in this point, have at least four hundred years antiquity, not only against us, but even beyond Christianity itself. And I suppose I may, without any injury to the memories of these holy men, who have been our forerunners in the faith, say, that it was the impression which these opinions of their philosophy had made upon them, that moved them, when they became Christians, to fall into conjectures concerning the state of the soul in the time of separation, not very much different from what they had believed before.” The truth is, that when Christianity became popular, and the profession of it fashionable, heathens, professing to be Christians, brought into the church all their heathenish notions, and purgatory among the rest.

Origen, St. Augustin, and even St. Jerome, have expressions that savour of purgatory ; or which at least show, that they in-

dulged themselves in some wild speculations about the state of the dead; and though they did not by any means entertain the nonsense of modern Papists upon this subject, they used expressions which have been laid hold of, and pleaded as almost equal to apostolical authority for this most *golden* article of the Romish faith.

It is very evident, that the churches which were planted by the Apostles knew nothing of purgatory, for the Apostles did not teach the doctrine, and it was never brought into the church by divine authority; but about the end of the sixth century, Pope Gregory, called the Great, began to give countenance to it; and then it came to have a place among other relics of ancient heathenism, which were first connived at, and then established as *profitable* additions to the religion of Christ. "From henceforth," says the learned prelate whom I have quoted above, "miracles and visions governed the church. The flames of *Ætna* and *Vesuvius* were thought to have been kindled on purpose to torment departed souls. Some were seen broiling upon gridirons, others roasting upon spits, some burning before a fire, others shivering in the water, or smoking in a chimney. The very ways to purgatory were now discovered; one in Sicily, another in Pozzueto, a third nearer home, in Ireland,—one found out by the help of an angel, another by the devil; insomuch, that Pope Gregory himself was carried away with these illusions, and which some, even at this day, are not ashamed to support. By these means came purgatory first to be established in the Roman church, in the sixth, seventh, and eighth centuries: but yet still the article appeared rude and unpolished. Pope Gregory discovered how certain souls, for their punishment, were confined to baths, and such like places on earth, but he had not, as yet, found out any one common place for them to be tormented in, in hell. Nay, for some ages after, it seems not to have been risen to a matter of certainty, so far was it yet from being an article of faith; insomuch, that in the twelfth century, many doubted of it, as we may gather by that expression of Otto Frisingensis, anno 1146, 'That there is in hell a place of purgatory, wherein such as are to be saved, are either only troubled with darkness, or decocted with the fire of expiation, *some do affirm*;' plainly enough implying that all did not believe it.

"But, however, purgatory is now become an article of faith, and of too comfortable an importance to be easily parted with; nor have I the vanity to hope I shall be able to argue those men out of it, who, by this craft, gain their living; and will, no doubt, therefore be as zealous in defence of it, as ever Demetrius was of the great goddess Diana upon the same account. But for those whose interest it rather is to be freed from these terrors

after death, which serve only to enrich the priests, and keep the laity all their lives in fear and subjection, I hope to satisfy them that these are only imaginary flames, invented for gain, established upon false grounds, and kept up by artifice and terrors to delude the people, but which themselves, many of them, no more believe, than did that great Cardinal, who minded one day to pose his chaplain, and proposed this question to him:—How many masses would serve to fetch a soul out of purgatory? To which, when he appeared, as well he might, unable to reply, the Cardinal thus pleasantly resolved the doubt,—“That just as many masses would serve to fetch a soul out of purgatory, as snow-balls would serve to heat an oven.” *Preservation against Popery*, Title viii. pp. 113, 114.

I have thus given a short history of the doctrine under discussion: in doing so, I have departed from the order observed by some great authors, who give a long history of the thing before they tell what it is. Conceiving it proper to tell what purgatory is, before I said much *about* it, I laid down in my last Number very particularly, what the Church of Rome declares to be of faith concerning it. I request the reader's attention to what is there laid down, in order to his better understanding of the remarks which I am now about to make.

Purgatory connects itself very naturally with the corrupt state of the Church of Rome, both in doctrine and practice. I have often had occasion to remark, that the belief of all the dogmas of Popery, and the practice of all its ceremonies, are perfectly consistent with a life of wickedness. In the Church of Rome, it is not necessary that a man be renewed in the spirit of his mind; it is not necessary that he crucify the flesh with the affections and lusts. If he has been favoured with a sprinkling of holy water by a priest, in baptism, this makes him a new creature, in ecclesiastical reckoning: this they say makes him a member of Christ; and he cannot be deprived of this connexion with the Saviour, unless he become a heretic, or be excommunicated. The sins which he commits are all wiped away, so far as regards their guilt and liableness to eternal punishment, every time he confesses and receives the absolution of his priest. He makes confession, and receives absolution, as often as he chooses to apply, and can afford to pay for it; but he makes it evident by his whole conduct, that he is not fit for heaven; that even to the hour of his death he is an unholy person. There remains even in the minds of Papists so much knowledge of natural religion, shall we call it? as existed even among heathens; or rather so much traditional knowledge of the character of God, as to assure them that persons dying with the pollution of sin unremoved, cannot enter into heaven, without undergoing a pu-

rification,—and this suggests to them the reasonableness and necessity of a purgatory.

Real Christianity requires no such middle state between this world and the next, in order to purge men either from the guilt or pollution of sin. Through Jesus Christ is “preached the forgiveness of sins; and by him all that believe, are justified from all things from which they could not be justified by the law of Moses,” Acts xiii. 38, 39. Those who are so justified, are also sanctified. “The blood of Jesus Christ cleanses from all sin.” “If we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all iniquity,” 1 John i. 9. Such passages of Scripture tell us plainly, that the blood of Christ is not only sufficient as an atonement for sin, but also sufficient for the cleansing of the soul from all its pollutions.

If the greatest sinner that ever trod upon the earth, were to believe in Christ to day, and die to-morrow, the righteousness of Christ in which he believes, would present him without spot, that is, perfectly justified, and perfectly sanctified, in the presence of God the Judge of all. But, supposing such a sinner to believe in Christ, and live in this world for fifty years, he would make it manifest that he was a new creature; he would be turned from the practice and love of sin, into the love and practice of righteousness. This is the necessary effect of believing the gospel, and where this effect is not produced, the gospel is not believed; for the “grace of God which bringeth salvation, teaches us, that denying ungodliness and worldly lusts, we should live soberly, and righteously, and godly, in this present world.” When a person thus interested in Christ comes to die, it is his happiness to reflect, that no debt stands against him; that no satisfaction is required of him; because Christ has made complete satisfaction to divine justice for all his transgressions; and his being made a new creature, and his being enabled to live a holy life, is an evidence to others as well as to himself, that he is a pardoned sinner; and that, like the penitent thief, the day he dies, he shall be with Christ in paradise, without any other purifying process than that which he has already undergone by the blood of Christ applied for his sanctification, and which he shall instantly undergo on the dissolution of the union between his soul and his body, when the one shall return to the dust, and the other to God who gave it.

These are truths which comfort the real Christian, and which support his mind in the view of death, and judgment, and eternity. He knows that to depart out of this world, and to be with Christ, are the same thing; that there is not an intervening moment between the two. If it were otherwise, it would be impossible to meet death with composure of mind, except it were in a

state of insensibility. How can a man resign himself to death without the most fearful apprehension, if he believes that there is a debt standing against him in the court of eternal justice,—a debt for which he must make satisfaction, by suffering torments in his own person, for a period, perhaps, much longer than his whole life in this world? But this is what every Papist is taught to believe with regard to himself, unless he shall die a martyr, or perform some signal service to the church, such as it is not possible for one in a million to perform.

It is true, the dying sinner, if he be a rich man, may compound for ages of misery, by bequeathing his wealth to the church; but the comfort which this is calculated to afford, must be greatly diminished by the reflection, that he is leaving his family in poverty: and, what is infinitely worse, he cannot be sure that his whole property, however great, will serve the purpose of saving his soul from ages of torment. His widow and children may become beggars, and yet, for any thing that he knows, he will derive but little relief, from his having robbed them to enrich the church. His ghostly guides are miserable comforters; for, with all their impudence, which in general is not small, they do not pretend to say *for certain*, that so much money will effectually deliver a soul from purgatory. Though it should be thousands of pounds, and as many masses as these can purchase, the utmost that can be effected by them, is only a certain degree of relief, or mitigation, or abridgment of the duration of the torments which a soul is condemned to endure, though for any thing that the sinner knows, or the priest can tell, the abridgment may be no more than one year out of a thousand.

The case which I have supposed is one of the most favourable, for it is the case of a rich man; and it cannot be denied, that Popery is a religion which looks upon the rich with a more favourable aspect than upon the poor. Those who are rich, may buy *some* mitigation of their torments, but those who have nothing to pay, must suffer in their own persons all the torments of the purgatorial fire, until they have made full satisfaction to divine justice. It is true, they may comfort themselves with the belief that their surviving friends will pay money to have masses said for them; but when they reflect how poor their friends are, and what a monstrous debt stands against them, I am afraid, nay, I am sure, no poor sinner can derive much comfort from this reflection.

GOTHER, indeed, tells us, that “such as have no relations or friends to pray for them, or give alms, or procure masses for their relief, are not neglected by the church, which makes a general commemoration of all the faithful departed in every mass, and in every one of the canonical hours of the divine office.” This is

avowedly a concession in favour of those who “ have *no relations or friends* to pray for them, or *give alms*, or procure masses for their relief;” from which it is clearly to be inferred, that those who have relations and friends can expect no relief but by their means, that is, by their giving alms, and procuring masses for them; which, in plain English, is neither more nor less than paying money to the priests.

By this arrangement, the poor who have no friends, are left in a very awkward predicament. They are declared to be in purgatory; but the church takes no particular interest in any one of them, just because there is nobody to pay money for them. They are brought in by the lump, in “ a general commemoration of *all the faithful* departed in every mass.” But such a general commemoration must be of little avail, when there is no specific reference to any individual case. In this general commemoration are included, all who paid for themselves, by bequeathing money for masses, and all whose friends have paid for them, as well as those who had neither money nor friends to leave behind them; and it may easily be supposed, that the *intentions* of the priests, in saying their masses, will be directed to the souls of those for whom they have been best paid; and the poor in purgatory, as well as the poor in this world, will be esteemed by mercenary priests as little worth.

It is worthy of remark, that, according to this much admired Popish author, there is in every mass, at this very day, a commemoration of *ALL* the faithful deceased. From the connexion of the words it appears, that this commemoration signifies prayers, alms, and masses, offered up to God for their relief; that is, of *all* the faithful that have departed out of this world, I suppose, since the days of the Apostles; for surely it will not be said, that the Christians of those days were not of the faithful. Then, according to this doctrine, they are all in purgatory still. The Church of Rome will not avow the inconsistency of offering up masses and prayers to God, for the relief of those who are already relieved, and happy in heaven. Then, according to the Popish notion of St. Peter having the keys of heaven, it will appear, that he has most tenaciously kept the door shut; for no sinner has passed thither out of purgatory since he received the commission. Now it may fairly be asked, for what purpose the priests have been saying their masses for so many hundred years? For what have they applied the millions of money extorted from the people, under the pretext of relieving souls from purgatory, when, so far as appears, not one soul has yet been relieved? Prayers and masses are yet offered up to God daily, for the relief of *them all!*

THE

Protestant,

No. LXXVII.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 1st, 1820.

THE holy council of Trent, in the decree concerning purgatory, which I gave in my seventy-fifth Number, prohibits the teaching of "those things which have reference only to a certain curiosity or superstition, or which savour of filthy lucre, as scandals, and causes of some offence to the faithful." At the same time, and in the same decree, it is positively enjoined upon the bishops, that they inculcate the doctrine, "that the suffrages of the faithful who are alive, namely, the sacrifices of the mass, orations, *acts of charity*, and other pious deeds, which it has been customary for the faithful to perform on behalf of the other faithful who are dead, should be piously and devoutly performed according to the institutions of the church."

The council seem to have been aware that some scandal and offence did arise from the pecuniary traffic which had been carried on in relation to their purgatory; and they prohibit such things as "*savour of filthy lucre*;" but we shall very much mistake the meaning of the holy synod, if we suppose that by "*filthy lucre*" they really mean gold and silver, or even bank notes, had there been such things in their time. They command the bishops to teach the people to perform "*acts of charity*" on behalf of the "*faithful who are dead*;" that is, to "*give money to the priests for the relief of the souls that are in purgatory.*"

The practice of many ages will be found a sound commentary on the text. It is by "*acts of charity*," performed by the faithful alive, for the sake of those who are dead, that Romish priests have found means to bring within their grasp an immense quantity of what they effect to call "*filthy lucre*," but which is really the delight of their hearts, and the desire of their eyes. For several ages before and after the sitting of this council, the priests contented themselves with what they could extort from rich and poor individuals; but it was reserved for the present age of im-

provement, to devise a plan, by which the poor might act as a body, in raising contributions upon the small scale of a penny a-week, in order to enrich the priests by purchasing the release of souls which are supposed to be suffering torments in purgatory. The following document, and reflections on this subject, are extracted from a pamphlet by the Rev. James Carlile, of Dublin. I need not make an apology to my Scotch readers for so large an extract, because, I suppose, few of them have seen the original work; and my readers in Dublin, to whom, I suppose, Mr. Carlile's book will be as familiar as mine is to the people in Glasgow, will excuse my inserting it, for the information of my own countrymen.

"I request," says Mr. Carlile, "the reader's particular attention to the following document, which is reprinted verbatim as it fell into my hands. He has doubtless heard of *penny a-week societies* for various purposes, such as relieving the poor, educating their children, furnishing them with the Scriptures; but he, perhaps, does not know that this system has been adopted by devout and charitable members of the Church of Rome, in this enlightened city of Dublin, for the purpose of raising money to relieve themselves and their friends from purgatory, when they shall go thither. Let him read, then, and be astonished.

*'Have pity on me, have pity on me,
'at least you, my Friends.'*

PURGATORIAN SOCIETY,

INSTITUTED JULY 1ST, 1813, AND HELD IN SAINT
JAMES'S CHAPEL.

In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy
Ghost—Amen.

*'It is therefore a holy and wholesome thought to pray for
he dead, that they may be loosed from their sins.'*

Machabees, chap. xii. ver. 46

THE members who compose the Society of the Office for the Dead, commenced on the above day, at the said place, adopting the spirit and meaning of the above sacred text, and wishing, in conformity to the divine precepts of the Holy Catholic Church, to extend their charitable views beyond the grave, by relieving, as far as in them lies, the suffering souls in purgatory, and inviting all tender hearted Catholics, who have a feeling sensibility of the duty they owe their departed parents, re-

lations and friends, who probably may stand more in need of their commiseration at present, than at any period of their life time, to assist in the charitable and pious purpose of shortening the duration of their sufferings by the most easy means imaginable, have agreed to, and adopted the following Rules :

Rule 1. That the affairs of this institution shall be regulated by the Superior, Rectors, and six of the members who compose the office for the dead, who shall attend on every Wednesday night, at half past eight o'clock, throughout the year, at the above named place, or any other place which may be hereafter appointed, and there, with attention and devotion, recite the office for the dead, agreeable to the intention that shall then be mentioned.

Rule 2. That every well disposed Catholic, wishing to contribute to the relief of the suffering souls in purgatory, shall pay one penny per week, which shall be appropriated to the procuring of masses to be offered up for the repose of the souls of the deceased parents, relations, and friends of all the subscribers to the institution in particular, and the faithful departed in general.

Rule 3. That on the first Monday of every month, a mass will be offered up in the parish chapel of St. James, at ten o'clock, for the spiritual and temporal welfare of the subscribers of this society.

Rule 4. That the Superior, Rectors, and Council shall continue in office for six calendar months, at the expiration of which time, candidates shall be nominated by the persons in office, who shall give due notice to the whole body of members who compose the office for the dead, that they may punctually attend on the first Wednesday night in July, at half past eight o'clock, and on the first Wednesday night in January, for the purpose of electing a Superior, Rectors, and Council, to serve the ensuing six months, and so in succession.

Rule 5. That each subscriber, on entering this society, do purchase a copy of these Rules, in order to defray the expenses incurred by printing and other contingencies, and that the money arising from the weekly subscriptions shall be disposed of to the most necessitated clergymen, who shall be required to give receipts for what they are paid.

Rule 6. That the spiritual benefits of this institution shall be conferred in the following manner, viz. Each subscriber shall be entitled to an office at the time of their death, another at the expiration of a month, and one at the end of twelve months after their decease ; also, the benefit of masses which shall be procured to be offered, by the money arising from subscriptions, and which shall be extended to their parents, relations, and friends, in the following order : that is to say, their fathers, mothers, brothers.

sisters, uncles, aunts, and if married, husbands, wives, and children, if they have any departed who lived to maturity.

Rule 7. That every member of the office for the dead, who serves the society in the capacity of Superior, shall, at the time of his death, be entitled to three masses, to be offered for the repose of his soul; and, also, every member who serves the office or Rector, shall be entitled to the benefit of two masses, and every subscriber, without distinction, shall be entitled to the benefit of one mass, each, provided that such member or subscriber shall die a natural death, be six months a subscriber to the institution, and be clear of all dues at the time of their departure; that care shall be taken, by the surviving Superior and Rectors, that such soul masses are punctually obtained, agreeable to the interest and meaning of this institution.

Rule 8. That the Superior, Rectors, and Council, be empowered to make (as occasion may require) such bye-laws as they shall think expedient, provided they do not interfere with the spirit of these Rules; said bye-laws are to be laid before the body at large, for their approbation, and that four shall form a quorum on the Council.

Rule 9. That the Superior shall on every All-Souls'-Day, advance to the parish priest of James's street chapel, whatever sum is necessary for obtaining an insertion in the mortality list of the altar, the names of the parents, relations, and friends, of all the subscribers to this institution, to be recommended to the prayers of the congregation at every mass throughout the year.

Subscriptions received, and subscribers registered at the chapel, on every Wednesday evening, from seven o'clock until nine, and in the school-room adjoining the chapel, on the first Sunday of February, May, August, and November, being quarterly days, from ten o'clock until one.

The books to be opened for the inspection of subscribers. *
Price three-pence.

J Coyne, Printer, 74, Cook-street.

Let the reader attend to this document. The Society, he will observe, was instituted about two years ago. † He will also observe that it is countenanced by the clergy at least those of St. James's, for it is held in the chapel. Let him then advert to the objects of it. They are to relieve suffering souls in purgatory, particularly those of the members of the society, when they shall

* Since the publication of this curious document, in the first edition of this Examination, the rules of several other similar societies, of still more recent formation, have been published; but as they are similar to those given above, it is unnecessary to insert them. They serve to show, however, that the utility of Purgatorian Societies, is very generally acknowledged by Roman Catholics.

† This was written in 1815.

go thither, and their relations who are already there, *by the most easy means imaginable*. And what are these means? Why, paying a penny per week, as the easiest manner of raising money to procure masses. It is natural to ask to whom this money is to go, which is expended in procuring masses? and the answer must be, to the clergy, for they alone can give these masses. But, besides the masses, there is mentioned in the 9th rule, a kind of subordinate help to the poor suffering souls, namely, insertion into the mortality list of the altar, which recommends them to the prayers of the congregation at every mass throughout the year; and this privilege, also, is to be purchased of the parish priest of St. James's by the society.

"In what a light does this place the priesthood? They believe, or at least they teach, that the friends of their flock are lying weltering in a lake of fire, from which they could deliver them, by saying masses for them, and recommending them to the prayers of the congregation, and yet they will not say these masses, nor so recommend them, unless they be regularly paid for it. How can a man represent himself as such a monster, and yet hold up his head in civilized society! What! shall I believe that a single soul is suffering torments so dreadful; that it may continue to suffer them for ages, that I have the means in my power of relieving it, and yet shall I coolly wait till I be paid, before I use these means? By what process of reasoning can men be brought to believe, that this is the religion given to us for our salvation, by our kind and merciful Father in Heaven? By what arguments can the poor be convinced that a system of extortion, which gives so manifest a preference to the rich, can be that gospel which was to be preached peculiarly to the poor?

"But the reader may be most surprised to learn, that intelligent, upright, and conscientious individuals belong to this society, and conduct it. The very style of correctness with which the rules of it are composed and arranged; the care and foresight with which they are fenced and guarded, show them to be the work of a man of judgment and prudence. The 5th rule provides that the money shall be disposed of to the most necessitated clergymen, who must give receipts for what they are paid. The 6th marks precisely the order and consanguinity in which the benefits of the society are to be extended, to *parents, relations, and friends*. The 7th gives encouragement to persons conducting the business of the society, and provides that a subscriber, in order to obtain the benefit of it, must be of six months standing; must die a natural death, *and must be clear of all dues at the time of his departure*. The 9th rule seems to be intended to provide a kind of remuneration for the use of the chapel of St. James's, for it confines the money that is to be expended in procuring the prayers of congregations, to the priest of

that parish. There is one point, indeed, which seems to be left very vague and indeterminate, namely, what precise effect the masses and prayers will have—whether they will relieve the souls from purgatory immediately, or whether they will only shorten the duration of their sufferings. That they may be relieved at once from purgatory, that they may even be saved from going thither by certain processes, or that the precise relief obtained may be ascertained, is manifest from some of the indulgences quoted above; one of which provides that he who complies with the terms of it shall never see purgatory; another, that if he were there, he shall be delivered from it; and another assures him of 90,000 years of respite. Now it would surely be satisfactory, to those who subscribe to this society, if they knew precisely how much it would take to deliver each soul, or what is the exact diminution of suffering that each mass effects; because, for aught I see, they may be paying for the relief of those who are already finally relieved: whereas, if they knew better what they were doing, they could save that money, and apply it to the relief of those who certainly need relief. I am afraid, however, that the clergy are too cunning to fix this matter with any great precision, for nothing can be more profitable in this traffic than a little uncertainty. The bare possibility of any ease being procured by a little money, for a dear friend recently deceased, must be an almost irresistible inducement to bestow it.

“ Oh! awful delusion! that men with the light of the gospel shining on their eyeballs, should persuade themselves, that the God of heaven would actually sell to them, for money, relief from some necessary purgation, or some merited punishment! Look at this society again, and say, whether it might not with much greater propriety be denominated, **A SOCIETY FOR THE RELIEF OF NECESSITOUS CLERGYMEN**, than for the relief of souls in purgatory. Survey the whole transaction. A self-elected, incorporated body declare, that they alone are commissioned by God, to teach what he chooses should be known, respecting eternity and the world of spirits; and that the truth of what they teach, nay, and the reality of their commission, are not to be examined, further than they themselves think fit to submit them to examination. Among many other doctrines equally profitable to themselves, they teach, that the souls even of those who listen to them implicitly, must go to a place of torment for a time, to be purified, before they enter on the infinite rewards of their implicit faith and obedience: that they, by performing certain mystical ceremonies or incantations, which they call mass, can shorten this torturing purgation, or release the soul from it altogether; that they are warranted, nay, for aught I know, commanded by God, to exact money for performing these masses, which money is to be appropriated to their own use; and they

countenance their people in forming societies to raise money, for the purpose of purchasing masses from the most necessitous among themselves. I appeal to any man of common discernment, if ever he met with a transaction, that bore fraud and imposture so legibly written on the face of it, as this does! And yet, where can we look for deliverance to our fellow countrymen, from these tricks that are every day practised upon them, and for the sake of which, they are studiously kept in the most profound ignorance. No ray of light is permitted to reach them; and, lest by any chance a passing gleam might shine upon them, they are taught to shut their eyes, and to believe that every one is their enemy, that would persuade them to look around them. 'Tis odds but they may be enraged against me for simply telling them that they are in darkness." *

I shall conclude this Number with some curious particulars relating to purgatory, not taken, indeed, from books of such authority as the Canons of the Council of Trent, but related by a Spanish priest, who was intimately acquainted with the opinions and most secret practices of his own order. He became a convert to the Protestant religion, and in 1715, he received orders in the Church of England. He writes like one who knew perfectly the truth of his statements; and I have never read or heard that they were contradicted.

"Pope Adrian the Third," says Mr. Gavin, "did confess, that there was no mention of purgatory in Scripture, or in the writings of the holy fathers; but notwithstanding this, the Council of Trent has settled the doctrine of purgatory, without alleging any one passage of the holy Scripture; and gave so much liberty

* The following article in the Quarterly Review for September, 1818, page 109, shews that a Purgatorian Society has been established also in London.

The Roman Catholics in London have an association for Sunday Schools,—and the reader may be edified by the title under which it has been instituted, and by some of its rules. It is called, a spiritual association in honour of the most Holy Trinity, and under the protection of the blessed Virgin Mary, for the relief of souls in purgatory, and instruction of the ignorant.

"All monies acquired by this charity, from subscriptions or otherwise, shall be destined to provide that the holy sacrifice of the mass be offered for the intentions of the society, and for the support of the schools."

"At the death of any member, mass shall be said three times for the repose of his (or her) soul. Masses shall be said every month for the deceased members of the society in general. The standing intentions of this society shall be: 1st. The soul most in need. 2d. The deceased members. 3d. The welfare of the living subscribers.

"A member may enter the names of his departed parents or friends in the books of the society, and such deceased persons shall be deemed members of the same, and partake of its spiritual advantages, as long as their subscriptions continue to be paid.

"The Rosary of the blessed Virgin Mary shall be said daily, for the intentions of the Society, and on no account whatever be omitted."

The association was formed in 1810.

to priests and friars by it, that they build in that fiery place, apartments for kings, princes, grandees, noblemen, merchants, and tradesmen, for ladies of quality, for gentlemen and tradesmen's wives, and for poor common people. These are the eight apartments which answer to the eight degrees of intense fire; and they make the people believe that the poor people only endure the least degree; the second being greater, is for gentlewomen and tradesmen's wives, and so on to the eighth degree, which being the greatest of all, is reserved for kings. By this wicked doctrine, they get gradually masses from all sorts and conditions of people, in proportion to their greatness. But, as the poor cannot give so many masses as the great, the lowest chamber in purgatory is always crowded with the reduced souls of those unfortunately fortunate people, for they say to them, that the providence of God has ordered every thing to the ease of his creatures; and foreseeing that the poor people could not afford the same number of masses that the rich could, his infinite goodness had placed them in the place of less sufferings in purgatory.

“But it is a remarkable thing, that many poor silly trademen's wives, desirous of honour in the next world, do ask the friars, whether the souls of their fathers, mothers, or sisters, can be removed from the second apartment (reckoning from the lowest) to the third? thinking by it, that though the third degree of fire is greater than the second, yet the souls would be better pleased in the company of ladies of quality. But the worst is, that the friar makes such women believe that he can do it very easily, if they give the same price for a mass that ladies of quality do give. I knew a shoemaker's wife, very ignorant, proud, and full of punctilios of honour, who went to a Franciscan friar, and told him, that she desired to know whether her father's soul was in purgatory or not? and in what apartment? The friar asked how many masses she could spare for it? she said, two; and the friar answered, your father's soul is among the beggars, upon hearing this the poor woman began to cry, and desired the friar to put him, if possible, in the fourth apartment, and she would pay him for it; and the *quantum* being settled, the friar did promise to place him there the next day. So the poor woman ever since gives out that her father was a rich merchant, for it was revealed to her that his soul is among the merchants in purgatory.

“Now what can we say, but that the Pope is the chief governor of that vast place, and priests and friars the quartermasters, that billet the souls according to their own fancies: and have the power, and give for money the king's apartments to the soul of a shoemaker, and that of a lady of quality to her washerwoman.

Master Key, vol. I p. 166.

THE

Protestant,

No. LXXXII.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 5th, 1820.

THE letter on which I am about to animadvert, is addressed "to the Roman Catholic clergy, and laity of the Archdiocese of Tuam;" and it is subscribed "Oliver Kelly, Roman Catholic Archbishop." He holds his title, no doubt, by authority of his lord and master, the Pope of Rome, whose mandate he is bound to obey; and, as I observed in my last Number, his letter is little more than an echo and amplification of that of his Holiness. He seems, however, to have entered very heartily into the cause; and he is evidently as much afraid of schools, and the Bible, as the Pope himself.

He begins thus:—"Dearly beloved brethren and children in Jesus Christ,—To guard the sacred deposit of religion, and to promote the happiness of the flock committed to my care, are important duties imposed upon me, and the dearest object of my pastoral solicitude. To these my thoughts are at all times directed. With this view, I have frequently visited the parishes of this extensive Archdiocese, 'exhorting every man, and teaching every man in all wisdom, that we may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus.' Col. ch. i. v. 28."

I cannot but admire the good opinion which his Reverence has of himself, and the value which he sets upon his labours. He, it seems, has been "teaching every man *in all wisdom*;" and he expects to "present every man perfect in Christ Jesus." How this is to be effected is not quite so clear; for though the Apostle Paul did speak in such language as this; and though he did propose to himself nothing less than the perfection of his spiritual children, he tells us how he expected to accomplish his object, which the Popish priest does not. It was by preaching Christ, the hope of glory, who, as such, was in the believing Colossians, that the Apostle both warned and taught them, and by

which he expected to present them perfect. But Oliver Kelly says nothing of this. He does not so much as mention the preaching of Christ among the "important duties imposed upon" him; and it is pretty generally known, that this is one of the last things that a Popish bishop would think of.

The same Apostle informs ordinary ministers how they may be instrumental in leading their people on to perfection. It is by means of the word of truth contained in the Holy Scriptures, which, he says, "are able to make men wise unto salvation." The "all wisdom" of which he speaks, is contained in the Scriptures; for he tells us again, "All scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is able to make the man of God perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works." But father Kelly tells us plainly, as we shall see by and by, that the Scriptures, so far from promoting the perfection which he aims at, are the principal hinderance of it. He strictly forbids the distribution of the Bible; and recommends, in preference, Reeves' History of the Bible, and two or three Catechisms; from which "abundant sources," says he, "Catholics will draw a purity of morals and doctrine, and a confirmation of their holy faith." From which it is evident, that the wisdom of his teaching, and the perfection to which he leads his people, are both different from those of the Apostle, whose words he seems to have quoted for the purpose of insulting his memory, or rather the Holy Spirit, under whose inspiration he wrote.

The Archdiocese of Tuam, seems, by Oliver Kelly's account, to have been a most abandoned district. Of late, however, it has been wonderfully reformed, by what means he says not; but he bears witness to the fact in the following words:—"I cannot conceal the consolation that I experience, when I reflect on your temperate, peaceful, and consistent demeanour under trials and temptations. Drunkenness, so incompatible with your temporal and eternal welfare, is not *now* so prevalent amongst you. Morning and evening prayer, that most essential duty of Christian piety, is universally enforced, and very generally observed. The Sabbath is no longer profaned by servile work, or by vain, unprofitable, or criminal amusements. Perjury, into which the ignorant in many districts have been too successfully seduced, by the machinations of wicked and interested men, is now, and I trust for ever, at an end," &c. So then, it seems, this Archdiocese was formerly notorious for drunkenness, Sabbath-profanation, and perjury; and it is not so now. If Oliver Kelly would speak the truth, he would tell us, that this happy change has taken place since the Hibernian Society's schools were established,—since the people were taught to read, and since they began to read the Bible. I am not sure that the reformation has been so great in

Tuam, or any where else, as he represents it; but the Society's Reports furnish abundant evidence, that a very great change to the better, has taken place in different quarters, since the establishment of their schools, and the circulation of the Scriptures. Kelly admits, and professes to rejoice in the fact, while he reviles that which has produced it. The poor man is really and seriously alarmed by this new state of things. Since the schools and the Bible were introduced, he admits, that there is less drunkenness, Sabbath-breaking, and perjury; and yet he maintains, that in no period of their existence were the people in greater danger. Let the reader hear his complaint in his own words:—

“ I deem it my duty to call the attention of each pastor, to the moral and religious education of the youth committed to his care; and I will not hesitate to declare, that at no period of our existence did circumstances more unite to call forth our zeal and exertions in this particular, than the present moment; a period when, under the semblance of a Christian education, every art and insinuation is resorted to, in order to make proselytes amongst the innocent and unsuspecting youth of our communion. If the design of extirpating the Catholic religion by violence and persecution, has been, *in some degree*, abandoned, to it has succeeded one more likely to effect its purpose, because less apparent. Recourse is had to *seduction* and insinuation. An attempt is made to strip off its natural deformity and turpitude, the crime of tampering with the religious principles of the poor. The schools that are established, are embellished with a thousand specious names, but at the bottom the evil lies concealed. Proselytism is the order of the day, and the enemies of our faith, like the serpent, creep and give death under flowers.”

In these words, the Reverend Oliver Kelly takes upon him to assert: first, “ That every art and insinuation is resorted to in order to make proselytes among the youth of his communion.” But this is nothing but a general sweeping assertion, which will be found to have no particular meaning attached to it. It is a mere figure of speech, like the *thousand* specious names by which the schools are called, while in reality they are known by only one or two, or, perhaps, three names at the most; * so the *every* art and insinuation, when reduced to sober English, will be found to mean no more, than that the teachers in the schools are very desirous to make the children acquainted with the Holy Scriptures; and that they earnestly exhort them to read them by themselves and to their parents. To such men as Father Kelly, this will no doubt appear a most insidious and dangerous

* Besides the Hibernian Society, there is the Sunday School Society for Ireland, and the Baptist Society for the support of native schools.

art. But whatever he, and such as he, may say to the contrary, it is an art which every Christian is bound to study and practise. He who has received the word of God, is bound by every tie of duty to make it known to his neighbour, though all the priests in the world should forbid it. He is not at liberty to make use of cunning, or any sort of insinuation that worldly policy may dictate : but he is warranted and commanded, in the way of even down plain dealing, to tell every man that the Bible is the word of God ; that he who receives the truth which it reveals shall be saved, while he that receives not the truth shall be condemned ; and whether those whom he addresses be Papists or Pagans, youths or adults, it is his duty to endeavour, not by compulsion, but by persuasion, to make proselytes of them ; that is, to win them to Christ, that their souls may be saved through him. The Societies which have established schools in Ireland, so far as I know, have never concealed, but openly avowed this to be their object ; and, therefore, they are guilty of nothing that can properly be called *insinuation*. They see their fellow subjects living in ignorance and misery ; the slaves of a cruel and gloomy superstition ; and they are openly and avowedly labouring to communicate to them the word of God, with the ability to read it. This, every Christian is bound to do. This, every inhabitant of this free country has a right to do ; and he who attempts to hinder any man, or any society from prosecuting this work of mercy, is an enemy to his fellow-creatures and to the liberty of his countrymen.

In this letter, we find, secondly, an admission by Oliver Kelly, that “ the design of extirpating the Catholic religion by violence and persecution, has been, *in some degree*, abandoned ;” that is, not altogether abandoned, but only in some degree. Now, I venture to affirm, that this priest never in his life witnessed,—that his father before him never witnessed,—nor his father before him, any attempt, in the slightest degree, on the part of our Protestant government, to extirpate the “ Catholic religion,” or any religion whatever, by means of violence and persecution. For ages, Papists have been allowed the free and unmolested exercise of their religion. Indeed this was at no time denied them, when they could keep themselves from plots and treasons. Since the commencement of the late reign, they have received one concession after another ; and at this moment the worship of the established church is not more free, or more protected by law, than is that of the Popish chapel ; and yet this titular Archbishop,—this man who professes to be teaching his people in all wisdom, has the effrontery to assert, that the design of extirpating his religion by violence and persecution, has been abandoned only in some degree ; that is, that such a design still exists, though

somewhat relaxed. Now, he knows that this is not true. Every priest in Ireland knows that the charge is false; but they seem to make it their daily business to persuade their people that there is such a design entertained against them; and thus to cherish the hatred with which the Papists generally regard their Protestant neighbours. It seems to be the sole study of these men to keep alive this hatred, and for purposes best known to themselves, at the very time when they are so clamorous for emancipation; that is, for admission into places of power and trust, when, no doubt, they would turn the hatred which they have cherished to some truly Popish purpose.

Yet, on this very subject, Oliver Kelly does not speak the sentiments of the great body of Irish Papists, as expressed by their leaders in Dublin, known by the name of the "Catholic Board." These leaders have actually gone the length of making an appeal to the Pope against their own government; and, therefore, it is no wonder that the Pope should interfere in the civil and domestic affairs of Ireland. In this appeal to the Pope, which was made about five years ago, it is not admitted that there has been any relaxation in the violence of the persecution to which they are exposed; and as there has been no change since that time, Kelly stands guilty of contradicting a public document, issued by the leading men of his own communion. I shall give an extract from this document, with some remarks, for which I am indebted to a pamphlet, entitled, "An Examination of the Address of the Roman Catholics of Ireland, to Pope Pius VII. By the Rev. William Thorpe, Dublin, 1816." This will afford the reader a specimen of the manner in which the "Irish people," as the Papists call themselves, speak of their sufferings:—

"Most Holy Father.—We, the Roman Catholic people of Ireland, most humbly approach your Holiness, imploring, for five millions of faithful children, the Apostolical benediction. We deem it unnecessary, Most Holy Father, to remind the Sovereign Pontiff of our church, of our peculiar claims to his protection and support; for we cannot, for a moment, imagine that your Holiness is unmindful of the constancy and devotion manifested to the Holy See, by the Roman Catholics of Ireland, in despite of the *most sanguinary and unrelenting persecution that ever aggrieved a Christian people*. We cannot, however, abstain from reminding our Most Holy Father, that although the persecution which we and our ancestors endured, was notoriously and avowedly inflicted upon us, on account of our adherence to, and connexion with the Holy See; nevertheless, the Catholics of Ireland never solicited the predecessors of your Holiness, at any period of that persecution, to alter, in the slightest degree, that connexion, or make any modification of the existing discipline of our

Holy Church, to obtain for the Roman Catholics of Ireland the repeal or mitigation of those cruel laws which proscribed them."

So then, if we will believe our Irish Papists, they are suffering, even at this day, a persecution the most *sanguinary* and *unrelenting* that ever aggrieved a Christian people. This reminds me of what I have read somewhere of a country minister, who had, by mistake, taken to the pulpit an old sermon which had been composed for a particular occasion. Having nothing else ready, he was obliged to go on with it, not suspecting that it contained any thing heterodox or unseasonable. He declaimed with great spirit against the vices of the age; and came unexpectedly upon the following sentence:—"Your sins are the cause of the dreadful epidemic which is at present raging in this neighbourhood." An honest justice of the peace, who had been listening with great attention, took the alarm, and starting up, loudly interrogated the speaker: "Where, Sir, where is it?" The minister, a little disconcerted, replied, "I do not know that it is any where except in this sermon." Now, let any man ask the Papists of Ireland, where is this sanguinary and unrelenting persecution carried on against them? and if there be an honest man amongst them, I am sure he will answer, no where that he knows of, except in the above libellous address and appeal of his brethren to the Pope of Rome.

I might contrast the present unmolested state of the Irish Papists, and the freedom of religious worship which they enjoy, with the state of the Lollards in this country before the Reformation, and with the state of the Waldenses and Bohemians, of whom tens of thousands were massacred in cold blood by order of the Pope of Rome, on account of their religion:—I might speak of the burning to death of hundreds of men, women, and children, during the reign of Bloody Mary, Queen of England; of the massacre of Paris; of the murder of many thousands of Protestants in France, in consequence of the revocation of the Edict of Nantz, by Lewis XIV; and of the sufferings of our own Covenanters in the west of Scotland, in the reigns of Charles II. and James II.; during which, more real suffering was inflicted on account of religion in one day, than Ireland has suffered for a hundred years: but every such appeal would be scouted at by our Papists; because in the cases referred to, the sufferers were not "Christian people;" but mere heretics, for shedding of whose blood they tell us, no commonwealth shall be called to answer. See the Rhemish note on Rev. xvii. 6., and the Douay note on Deut. xvii. 8., in which it is boldly maintained, that God has given power to the church's guides; that is, to the priests, even under the New Testament, to *punish with death such as proudly*

*refuse to obey their decisions.** The version of the Bible containing this open avowal of the power of the priests of the Church of Rome to punish all heretics with death, was lately published in Dublin, under the sanction of their highest dignitaries, in weekly Numbers, and, for any thing that I know, is publicly circulated through the country to this day. And the people who inculcate such doctrine, living unmolested, have the effrontery to complain to a foreign power, that they are the objects of the most sanguinary and unrelenting persecution!

I have been accused of want of liberality and politeness, because I have represented our Papists as trained to falsehood, and unable to speak the truth on any subject in which their religion is concerned. I am perfectly convinced that I have said nothing but what is strictly true; and in corroboration of what I have said on the subject of their falsifying, I quote the following passage from Mr. Thorpe's pamphlet already referred to. But what need is there of any authority? When the Papists tell us that they are suffering such persecution, all the world knows that it is a lie; and they themselves know it to be a lie; but they expect by means of it to deceive the Pope, and other foreign powers, in order to embarrass the government, and, if possible, terrify them into a concession of their arrogant demands.

"They complain," says Mr. Thorpe, "of persecution notoriously and avowedly inflicted upon them, on account of their adherence to, and connexion with the Holy See; and this persecution they solemnly assure the world, is the most sanguinary and unrelenting that ever aggrieved a Christian people. What effect is this likely to produce on those unacquainted with the real state of the case? It must excite in them mingled emotions of pity and indignation: pity for the unfortunate sufferers, and indignation against the government which oppresses them. It would not be surprising if Roman Catholics in foreign countries, sympathizing with their afflicted brethren in Ireland, should institute

* Since the above was in the printers' hands, I have received the following details from a correspondent:—"If we may believe historians, Pope Julius, in seven years, was the occasion of the slaughter of 200,000 Christians. The massacre in France cut off 100,000, in three months. P. Perionius avers, that in the persecution of the Albigenses and Waldenses, 1,000,000 lost their lives. From the beginning of the order of Jesuits, till 1580, that is, thirty or forty years, 900,000 perished, saith Balduinus. The Duke of Alva, by the hangman, put 36,000 to death. Vergerius affirms, that the Inquisition, in thirty years, destroyed 150,000. To all this, I may add the Irish rebellion, in which 300,000 were destroyed, as Lord Orrery reports in a paper printed in the reign of Charles II.; making a total of *two millions, six hundred, and eighty-six thousand.*" These horrible facts speak for themselves. Many of a like kind might be added but I reserve this as a separate subject of discussion.

an inquiry into the nature and extent of their grievances, and imitating the conduct of Protestants among us, towards the sufferers in the South of France, call on their respective governments to interpose for their relief. If the sympathies of British Protestants have been kindled by a few assassinations,—by the massacre of a few scores of people in France, surely foreign Roman Catholics cannot hear unmoved the cries of five millions of their brethren in Ireland, tortured by the most sanguinary and unrelenting persecution that ever aggrieved a Christian people. At this moment, perhaps, they are endeavouring to calculate how many have been slaughtered, or picturing to themselves the cruel tortures, amidst which they have been deprived of life; or perhaps they are preparing an asylum for the small remnant of the priesthood, which, after the conflagration of their sacred edifices, may have escaped the general massacre.* If such have not been the effects of this document on the mind of foreigners, we are not to thank the Catholic leaders for it; for this, like their other measures is equally calculated to render the government odious abroad, and insecure at home. But what are we to think of the men who deliberately and unblushingly can give such falsehoods under their hand? Among the many bad signs of the times, is there a worse one than that total disregard of truth and moral character, in which those persons seem to glory, who assume to be political leaders in Ireland? Does it not appear from their public conduct, as if they had forgotten all distinction between truth and falsehood? Do we not see them daily distorting every fact, whether of a public or private nature, and, with signal effrontery, fabricating such falsehoods as may best suit their purposes of malice or revenge, or political irritation? And what is their conduct on detection, or when any attempt is made to disabuse the public mind? They bluster and bully, and make a noise about their honour; as if a calumniator were less a calumniator after he had bullied and fought, than before; or as if the stain of falsehood could be covered by the stain of blood.”

pp. 14, 15.

I intend to resume this subject in my next.

* The Author may keep himself at ease on this score. There is little danger of Papists in foreign countries giving themselves the trouble of sympathizing with those in Ireland; much less of being at the expense of providing for them. They know one another too well to give much credit to such representations; besides, they have neither sympathy nor money to spare for the relief of their *living* brethren, their whole stock of both being required for the *dead* in Purgatory.

THE
Protestant,

No. LXXXIII.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 12th, 1820.

IN my last Number, I introduced Oliver Kelly, Popish Archbishop of Tuam, as admitting that the design of converting Irish Papists, by means of violence and persecution, was, in some degree, abandoned; and I shewed, that on this subject he was guilty of contradicting his brethren, the Popish leaders in Dublin, who, in an appeal to the Pope, assure his Holiness, that they are still exposed to "the most sanguinary and unrelenting persecution that ever aggrieved a Christian people." In my last Number, I declared this to be a most impudent falsehood, as all the world knows it to be; but, in order to bring the matter more distinctly before the eye of the reader, I make another extract from Mr. Thorpe's pamphlet:—

"Where can even a trace of such persecution be discovered? Look at the various classes of the Roman Catholics. Examine first the peasantry and working tradesmen. Are the former obstructed or oppressed, on the ground of religion, in taking or cultivating land? Are the latter shackled in the choice or exercise of their manual employments? No: there is literally no shadow of distinction between them and Protestants of the same rank. Go up higher to the departments of trade and commerce. Do the Roman Catholics labour under any disqualifications, or are they in any respect obstructed in those pursuits? No: they have precisely the same facilities, privileges, and rights, which Protestants possess. And even in the professions of law and medicine, (from the established church they are necessarily excluded,) the same rule holds good, as to every thing really important to the great mass of persons engaged in those professions. That of medicine, with all its honours and emoluments, is as free to them as to Protestants: and if, in the department of law, there are a few situations to which Protestants exclusively are

eligible, those situations are so few, and, from the competition arising from Protestant numbers and talents, so few of them, even though they were open to all, would be attainable by Roman Catholics, that this profession is scarcely an exception to the general rule. But how are they situated as to opportunities of instruction? Are any obstacles thrown in the way of their advancement in learning and knowledge? The very reverse. They possess even greater facilities in this respect than Protestants. Various schools, in which there is no interference with their religious opinions, have been instituted for their instruction, and are supported by the contributions of Protestants. The only Protestant University in Ireland is open to them. Nor is this all; a college for their *exclusive advantage has been founded, and endowed by the Protestant Legislature.*

“ If any where, then we may expect to find, in what concerns the exercise of their religion, some traces of the persecution of which they complain. Let us therefore examine how they are situated in this respect. Are they obstructed or discouraged in the exercise of their worship? No: they are secured in the full, free, and most public exercise of all the rites and ceremonies of their church. Are they limited as to the number of their clergy, or restrained from making a suitable provision for them? Their own statements on this subject furnish the best answer to this question. They have in Ireland, according to their own account, “ four Archbishops, twenty-four bishops, eleven hundred parish priests, eight hundred curates, and between two and three hundred regular clergy of various orders:” and as to their emoluments, an estimate may be formed from this circumstance, that the parish priest of a small village in the county of Limerick, enjoys, (as they have lately assured the public,) an income of £300 per annum. There is but one enquiry more. Are they destitute of proper edifices in which to receive their congregations, and to conduct their religious services? Any one who has lately travelled through Ireland is competent to answer this question. Their chapels are as numerous as the parish churches, and, in many places, far exceed them in splendour of external ornament. This fact deserves particular notice; because those chapels have been erected, in almost every instance, on the estates of Protestants, (very frequently the ground given free of rent,) and by funds, to which Protestants have been the most liberal contributors. Such is the real condition of the Roman Catholics in Ireland, at the very moment that they have had the signal effrontery to complain to the Pope, and to state, in the face of Europe, that they are the victims of the most sanguinary and unrelenting persecution that ever aggrrieved a Christian people.” pp. 16—18.

I have made this long extract, in order to let my readers know

the real condition of the Papists in Ireland, with regard to religious liberty. What would our suffering forefathers in Scotland have given for the hundredth part of the liberty which Papists now enjoy in Ireland, and in every part of the British dominions? The fact is, their civil privileges are equal to those of other dissenters; and their religious worship is as free as that of the established church in any of the three kingdoms. What then is the sanguinary and unrelenting persecution of which they are the victims? It is nothing else than being deprived of the power of persecuting others; that is, the power of compelling all men to submit to the Pope of Rome, and to the other "church guides of the New Testament," who have the power of "punishing with death such as proudly refuse to obey their decisions." *Douay Note on Deut. xviii. 8.* Until the Papists of Ireland have this power, concede what you will, they will not be satisfied, or cease to complain of the sanguinary persecution, of which they affect to be the victims. I know that thousands of good-natured Protestants, whose own minds are divested of such intolerant sentiments, will cry out against this assertion, as illiberal and uncharitable. No matter: it is sober truth that I write; and let any one who doubts of this, tell what Papists mean by the sanguinary persecution of which they complain to their Holy Father, against their own government. It is most certain they have nothing to complain of, but that they have not the power of the State in their own hands; and from the manner in which they have always used such power when they had it, we may judge what they will do when they shall have it again.

But to return to Father Kelly's letter:—he tells us, at the present moment, "under the semblance of a Christian education, every art and insinuation is resorted to, in order to make proselytes amongst the innocent and unsuspecting youth of our communion." And again, he says, since violence and persecution have been, in some degree, abandoned, "recourse has been had to *seduction* and insinuation." It is not denied by Dr. Kelly, that the object of the Society is chiefly to teach the children to read the Bible; yet he calls this the "*semblance* of a Christian education." What are we to infer from this, but that, in his opinion, Christian education does not consist in teaching the word of Christ? This is indeed plainly avowed in the sequel of his letter, in which the Catechism of the four Archbishops, Kirwan's Catechism, and Reeves' History of the Bible, are preferred before the Bible itself. Teaching these, it seems, is Christian education; teaching the Bible is only the semblance of it!

"An attempt," says the Doctor, "is made to strip of its natural deformity and turpitude, the crime of tampering with the religious principles of the poor." That is, the *crime* of instruct-

ing the poor ; for this is the only thing which he has to object to the Schools, and those who conduct them. This, he calls tampering with their religious principles,—this, he says, is done with every art and insinuation ; and he tells us, that recourse is ever had to seduction. As these are mere assertions, without the shadow of proof ; and as there is not so much as an attempt to establish a single instance of seduction on the part of the teachers we may pass this over as unworthy of further notice, and attend a little to what is called “ tampering with the religious principles of the poor,” and of the “ innocent and unsuspecting youth” of the Romish communion.

I observe, then, that there never was an attempt made to instruct the ignorant, or to reclaim those who were living in error, that was not liable to the same objection. The Apostles of Christ did the very same thing which Dr. Kelly complains of. They tampered with the religious principles of both Jews and Gentiles, whether they were young or old, learned or illiterate. That is, they endeavoured to convince them of error, and to persuade them to embrace the truth. It is in this sense that I use the word *tamper*, for this is the very thing that grieves and alarms Dr. Kelly, and which he holds up as a crime of great deformity and turpitude.

If the first Christians that came into Britain, had not tampered with the religious principles of the people, we might all have been at this day rude heathens, worshipping the works of our own hands. If the fathers of the Reformation had not tampered with the religious principles of our forefathers, we might have been as our fathers were for ages, the miserable slaves of Rome. Now, I maintain, that it is the duty of every Christian, in the sense in which I use the word *tamper*, to deal with his neighbours, whom he finds living in the gross errors of idolatry and superstition. I do not say that every one should become a public preacher, for this requires qualifications which every Christian does not possess ; but it is the duty of every one, as he has opportunity, by Christian conversation and Christian example, to win his erring neighbour from the worship of idols, and from every principle and practice that is inconsistent with the gospel of Christ. This is the best way in which a man can shew his love to God and to his brother also.

In this way of private dealing with one who was in error, or what Dr. Kelly would call tampering with the religious principles of the poor, we have the very highest example in the conduct of Christ himself. I refer to the case of the woman of Samaria whom Christ met at the well. She was descended from that mixed race whom the King of Assyria placed in the land of Israel, after the captivity of the ten tribes, of whom it is related,

that "they feared the Lord, and served their own gods, after the manner of the nations," 2 Kings xvii. 33. They made a profession of the true religion, so far as it served their purpose; but to the worship of the God of Israel, they added the worship of their own gods, just as Papists do; who, to the worship of God, add the worship of the Virgin Mary, and all the saints. They were acquainted with the writings of the prophets. They paid great respect to the ground which Jacob had trode, and to the well out of which he had drank. The woman, it appears, knew about as much of the promise of a Messiah to come, as Papists do of the history of his having come. The one knows the fact, and the other knew the promise, to equally little purpose; because the acknowledged truth in both cases was, and is, mixed up with so much error, as to obstruct its salutary influence upon the heart and conscience. In short, the Samaritans stood in the same relation, or rather in the same opposition, to the true church of God, as it existed among the Jews, as Papists do to the same church, as it now exists among the Protestants; for notwithstanding the errors and corruptions which prevailed among the Jews, the true church was with them; and in their controversy with the Samaritans, they had the right side of the question. Now, Christ addressed the woman who belonged to the sect of the Samaritans, in such a style as Dr. Kelly will call tampering with her religious principles:—"Ye worship ye know not what; we know what we worship." Call it tampering, or give it what name you please, I hold it not only lawful, but laudable, nay, an imperious duty, for every well informed Christian, who has an opportunity, to address those who worship idols, whether they be Papists or Pagans, in similar language, and to tell them that "salvation is of the Jews;" that is, of him who took human nature of the seed of Abraham; that salvation is of him alone, without the assistance or co-operation of any creature; and that it is only in so far as men know him, that they know what they worship, or know that their worship is acceptable, or that they will receive, from the object of their worship, the blessings which they ask of him.

If I saw a poor woman counting her beads, and saying her *Aves* to the Virgin Mary, I would not hesitate to tell her plainly, but affectionately, "Ye worship ye know not what." If I saw a company of ignorant creatures kneeling and praying before a crucifix, I would say, "Ye worship ye know not what." If I were a teacher of a school, and if a child were to bring into it one of his Catechisms, containing prayers to the Virgin Mary, I would tell him, that neither he, nor his parents, nor his priest, knew what they worshipped; and, because his Catechism would not contain the second commandment, I would shew him, in the

Bible, both the second and the first : " Thou shalt have no other gods before me ;—Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any likeness of any thing in the heavens or in the earth ; Thou shalt not bow down to them nor serve them." I do not know that the teachers of the schools in Ireland are at all this pains, or that they would conceive this to be their duty. The object of the schools is indeed not this, but to teach the children to read the Bible : but I think a faithful Christian teacher could scarcely avoid what I have described as his duty, when circumstances afforded him an opportunity.

This would be called tampering with the children and with their parents ; but it is all fair and open. Popish priests are not prevented from tampering with Protestant parents, or children, when they meet with them ; their efforts in this way are well known ; and if I were to use the language of Dr. Kelly, I would call them *insidious* and *seductive*. But the people of Ireland are free, if they choose to enjoy their freedom. They are at liberty to listen to any one who may propose to instruct them. But Dr. Kelly and the Pope declare their purpose to deprive them of this liberty, if they can. They will not allow them to have the Bible, nor to attend the schools where the reading of it is taught. This is assuming an authority and a control over the people, which neither the sovereign, nor the legislature of the empire assumes.

That which Oliver Kelly would call tampering with the religious principles of the poor woman, was followed by the most blessed consequences both to herself and to her neighbours (see John, chap. iv.), as no doubt the knowledge communicated by those who teach the people to read the Bible, has been to many persons in Ireland, in the present day. The Samaritan priests would, no doubt, rage and storm against tampering with the religious principles of the people, just as Dr. Kelly does now ; but the poor woman obtained the salvation of her soul ; her believing neighbours did the same ; the leaven of sacred saving truth spread among the people ; and after the Apostles had begun to preach that Christ was exalted, Samaria was the first place from which they heard the joyful tidings that the word of God was received.

If I am not mistaken, Dr. Kelly himself would not be injured, but greatly benefited by a little tampering. It will perhaps excite in his mind great indignation, to be called to account for his religious principles by a layman, and by one who is also a heretic. But there was a greater man than Dr. Kelly—a man who was eloquent and mighty in the Scriptures, who afterwards became a companion, and fellow labourer of the Apostle Paul, who derived great benefit from the tampering of two lay persons,

namely a tradesman and his wife, who, perceiving that, though a zealous preacher, he was mistaken with regard to some important points, took him aside, and "explained to him the way of God more perfectly." (See Acts xviii. 2, 3, 24—28.) Apollos was, no doubt, thankful for the tampering of these plain honest persons, and he enjoyed the benefit of it all the days of his life.

If I could indulge the supposition that Dr. Kelly was as humble and docile a Christian as Apollos, and as ready to take a hint from The Protestant, as Apollos was to take a lesson from Aquila, the tentmaker, and his wife Priscilla, I would ask the Doctor, who they are whom he speaks of as the *innocent youth* of his communion? By a little tampering with his Reverence; that is, by a few lessons out of the Bible, I could shew him that there are no innocent youth in the world, either in his communion or any other. Does he not know that every imagination of the thought of the heart of man, is evil from his youth up;—evil and only evil continually? (Gen. vi. 5, viii. 21) That all have sinned and come short of the glory of God? (Rom. iii. 23) That, in short, the whole world is guilty before God? (v. 19.) Does a man who professes to be teaching his flock in all wisdom not know this? If he does not, he is a pretty man to make such professions: if he does know it, he must stand convicted of wilfully contradicting the word of God, and misrepresenting the state and character of his flock. In a religious sense, there is no man innocent. All stand guilty before God. Those who believe in Christ are saved from their sins, and from the punishment which they deserve; but they will not speak of themselves as innocent; nor will those who know them call them innocent. They are sinners saved by grace. I most earnestly recommend the consideration of this subject to Dr. Kelly, and to every Papist who reads my pages. Let them learn and understand what they all are by nature, and by practice: Let them attend to the testimony of Christ, with regard to the way, and the only way, by which a sinner becomes just before God, and we shall hear no more of their own innocence or righteousness. If they believe the testimony, they will renounce all trust in the Pope, or the Virgin Mary, or in any fellow creature, and submit to the righteousness of God, which is by faith in Jesus Christ.

I think British Christians have been much to blame, because they have *tampered* so little with the religious principles of the poor in Ireland. We have long acted upon the principle avowed by the murderer Cain, who spurned the idea of being his brother's keeper; that is, he considered it none of his business to know where his brother was, or how he was. Christians on this side of the channel, were not ignorant of the condition of their brethren in the sister kingdom; but it did not occur to them,

at least for a long period, that they had any particular duty to perform towards them. If they be ignorant, superstitious, and idolatrous, let them remain so, seems to have been the general sentiment, for I do not know how long a period. This has now given place to sentiments more congenial to Christianity, and to corresponding exertions, which, by the divine blessing, will, in a few years, give a new character to the Irish population. The benign influence of the Bible has already begun to appear. Had the same efforts been made fifty years ago, the Pope would not, at this day, have had such a hold of the consciences of the Irish people; and it is to be hoped that fifty years hence, he will have no hold of them at all.

Why should not this be distinctly avowed as the object and hope of Protestants, and the object of their benevolent exertions? Papists do not hesitate to express their hope, and to labour incessantly to bring Protestants over to their communion. For this purpose they are tampering with the poor people every day. I do not wish to deprive them of this privilege. I would not prevent them from doing what they can, by fair argument, to gain proselytes, if there be such a thing as fair argument among them, which I confess I have never seen or heard of; but I would have our Protestants to equal them in zeal, and to excel them in honesty;—to meet them like Protestants on every point of difference; to tell them, “we believe you are in error, and that you are training up your people in error and idolatry; that we bring to you the Bible, which is the word of God, as you yourselves allow, though you wish to keep it from your people; that we are ready and willing to have our principles tried on this ground alone; that we will exercise no power or authority to compel any man to yield to us, and we require that you exercise no authority or power over the consciences of men, to prevent them from hearing us.” I know that Papists will not consent to such a trial of their principles. Their absolute power over the consciences of their people is vigorously exercised to prevent them from coming to such a trial, at the very time that they are making a hue and cry against their Protestant neighbours, who exercise no power whatever, and who pretend to none, but that of persuasion, which, with truth on their side, is sufficient for all their benevolent purposes.

There is a slight anachronism in my last Number, which the reader may correct, by substituting the word *late* for *present*, in page 252, the 8th line from the bottom. The proof sheet passed through my hands the day before the melancholy intelligence of the late King's death reached Glasgow, and the pages being immediately stereotyped, the word could not be altered.

THE
Protestant,

No. LXXVIII.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 8th, 1820.

I MENTIONED in my last Number, on the authority of the Rev. Mr. Gavin, originally a Popish priest in Spain, and afterwards a minister of the Church of England, that purgatory was divided into eight apartments; that the lowest of these was occupied by the souls of poor persons, and the highest by the souls of kings; and that the degree of torment which the souls in purgatory suffered was in proportion to the dignity of the apartments which they occupied; those in the lower vaults suffering less, and those in the higher ones suffering more, for no other reason, than that the friends of the latter, are supposed able to pay large sums for relief, while the friends of the former can pay little or nothing; and it must be allowed to be equitable, at least in Popish reckoning, that if the rich heirs of kings and princes do not pay liberally for the repose of the souls of their deceased friends, the deceased must pay the debt of suffering in their own persons; whereas the poor souls whose friends have little to pay, will get off after suffering little.

This arrangement is admirably calculated to enrich the dealers in masses, which are understood to have such efficacy in procuring relief to the souls in purgatory; that is, to enrich the priests, who by means of this doctrine, find ready access to the purses of rich widows, and others, whose deceased husbands and relations gave no evidence, during life, of being fit for heaven. The more wicked they had been, the better for the church, provided they left plenty of money, as the more masses were necessary for their relief, and the price of masses is understood to bear some proportion to the wealth of the persons at whose request and on whose behalf they are said.

In countries where Popery is the established religion, especially

in those where no other is suffered to be professed, it is easy for the priests, by dreams and revelations, to extort what they please from the rich dupes of their gloomy superstition. If a priest or a nun has only dreamed that such a one's father or mother is suffering dreadful torments in purgatory, this will be enough to command a thousand masses, and a thousand guineas to pay for them, if the relations of the deceased be able to pay so much; if not, the priests will take what they can give for the present, and more when they can get it.

"In the latter end of king Charles the Second's reign," says Mr. Gavin, meaning king Charles of Spain, "a nun of Gaudalajara wrote a letter to his Majesty, acquainting him that it was revealed to her by an angel, that the soul of his father, Philip the Fourth, was still in purgatory, all alone in the royal apartment; and likewise, in the lowest chamber, the said king Philip's shoemaker; and that upon saying so many masses, both should be delivered out of it, and should go to enjoy the ravishing pleasures of an eternal life. The nun was reputed a saint upon earth, and the simple king gave orders to his confessor to say, or order so many masses to be said for that purpose; after which the nun wrote again to his Majesty, congratulating and wishing him joy for the arrival of his father in heaven; but that the shoemaker, who was seven degrees lower than Philip in purgatory, was then seven degrees higher than his Majesty in heaven, because of his better life on earth." Philip it seems had been notoriously guilty of a particular vice, of which the nun reminds his son Charles; the shoemaker in this respect had been innocent; but, said she, "all had been forgiven him (i. e. the king) on account of the masses."

"When some ignorant people pay for a mass, and are willing to know whether the soul for which the mass is said, is, after the mass, delivered out of purgatory, the friar makes them believe, that the soul will appear in the figure of a mouse within the tabernacle of the altar, if it is not out of it, and then it is a sign that that soul wants more masses; and if the mouse doth not appear, that soul is in heaven. So when the mass is over, he goes to the tabernacle backwards, where is a little door with a crystal, which the people look through; but O pitiful thing! they see a mouse which the friars keep perhaps for the purpose; and so the poor sets give more money for more masses, till they see the mouse no more. They have a revelation ready at hand, to say, that such a devout person was told by an angel, that the soul for which the mass is said, was to appear in the figure of a mouse in the sacrario, or tabernacle." *Master Key, Vol. I. p. 168—170.*

This story of the mouse being made use of as a sign, to shew

whether or not souls were delivered out of purgatory, reminds me of a communication from a reverend gentleman, which has been long lying past me, because I had not sooner a proper opportunity of introducing it. It relates to a sign which the priests give, when they think proper, that certain souls are delivered from purgatory.

“About seventeen years ago,” says my correspondent, “a lady, now living in Edinburgh, had occasion to be in Dublin, and through means of a gentleman from this country, was introduced to a Popish chapel, on an occasion when a number of souls were to be translated out of purgatory. The place was very brilliantly lighted. The priest was seated on an eminence, with a table before him. The audience was in expectation, when a relation of each of the deceased persons, whose souls were that night to be released, appeared, and in passing before the priest, each laid an elegant and well filled purse on the table before him, who, after nodding satisfaction, most readily conveyed it to a receptacle, where it might be preserved till a fit opportunity of otherwise disposing of it. Having received his wages, the priest immediately began his operations, and soon intimated that the souls were translated, and would immediately make their appearance. Immediately a moveable part of the floor, unoccupied of course, opened, and there issued forth from it living creatures, as black as jet. When the little creatures began to move about, in order to prevent the deception from being detected, the lights were all extinguished, as if by magic. The lady had eyed the souls’ representatives very narrowly, and had observed that there was one of them within her reach; and with a degree of courage, which would not have been exerted by every one in her circumstances, she seized on the animal; she put it into her pocket, for ladies wore pockets in those days; she took it home, and showed it to the gentleman who had introduced her to the chapel, when it turned out to be a crab dressed in black velvet. I need scarcely add, that the lady was induced by the entreaties of the gentleman to destroy the creature, and maintain secrecy, at least in Ireland, as she valued her own life. I have the story from a daughter of the lady who laid hold on the emancipated spirit, and I believe her entitled to the highest credit, otherwise I would not have troubled you with the story.”

The above is, indeed, such an absurd, ridiculous, and childish piece of imposition, that it is with difficulty one can give credit to it; and yet, from the respectability of the channel through which it has been conveyed to me, I have no doubt of its truth: the credibility of things of this kind, must not be estimated by the rules by which we would judge of the credibility of what is said to take place among well informed persons. No minister in

Scotland, of any denomination, could practise such a trick upon his people; because the people in Scotland are accustomed to think for themselves, and to inquire into the meaning and the evidences of things; but the people in Ireland, and, indeed, the people in other places where Popery is predominant, are not allowed to think for themselves: they must receive implicitly what their priests tell them, or be excommunicated, and be made to taste of the pains of purgatory even in the present life.

In the course of my reading, I have met with something similar to the above story of the crabs,—perhaps it may be in the letter of some correspondent, on which I cannot at present lay my hands; and, therefore, I cannot vouch for the fact, though there rests no doubt as to its truth on my own mind; because I believe there is no trick, however absurd, to which the priests will not have recourse, in order to deceive the people, and swindle them out of their money. A country priest had been complaining grievously against his congregation, for their hard-heartedness in not procuring a sufficient number of masses for the relief of the souls of their deceased relations. He invited some of them to come to him at a certain hour of the night, and he would let them see the souls which were in torment, and which called for relief. Some had the courage to accept the invitation; and from a place which overlooked the church-yard, he showed them a number of lights moving about among the grave-stones, and declared that these were the souls of persons deceased, which were crying from purgatory, for prayers and masses for their release. Some one was bold enough to try to get more intimately acquainted with one of these moving lights; and it turned out to be a crab with a lighted candle-end fixed upon its back! With half a dozen of such agents, it was easy for an artful priest to impose upon his whole parish; and to make one who had a friend lately deceased, pay his last shilling for his relief, that at least he might be saved from the misery of wandering like a ghost about the grave's mouth.

It will be asked again, how *is* it possible to make the people believe such things? In reply, I have only to say, that when the priests have got them to disbelieve their own senses, which they do every time that they attend mass; when they believe what they see to be a wafer, to be the Saviour of the world, it is easy to make them believe any thing else that may serve the purpose of maintaining the authority of their ghostly guides.

The following extract of a letter from a gentleman in Rome, to his friend here, bears some relation to this subject. It refers to a personage, who, if history says what is true, required no small degree of purgation before she was fit for heaven; and, yet it seems, that priests were labouring with all their might, saying

masses, in order to facilitate her progress through purgatory as fast as possible.

“ January 8th, 1819.—The Queen of Spain died here the other day, and is to be buried to-morrow with pomp. I saw her lying in state ; and a more ridiculous spectacle I never saw in my life. She was lying dressed in her finest apparel, on cloth of gold, exposed to the view of every person. A guard of honour stood around the bed ; and the whole suite of rooms were covered with black, and filled with altars, at which a dozen of priests were constantly saying mass, night and day, for the purpose of facilitating her Majesty’s journey through purgatory. I was obliged to submit to a good hard squeeze before admittance could be got, the crowd was so great. Her hair is curled every day, the same as if she was alive. Her dressing maid attends as usual ; and breakfast and dinner are served up to her as formerly, which are ate in honour of her arrival at the gates of paradise. To night, she is to be carried to St. Maria Maggioro, preparatory to her funeral ceremony to-morrow.”

We learn from the New Testament, that the heathen expected to be heard for their much speaking ; that is, from the use of many words, and many repetitions in their prayers. The palace of the deceased Queen presented, on the above occasion, a lively example of heathen worship. There were a dozen priests constantly employed, day and night, saying masses for the repose of her soul. Now this was an incessant repetition of the same thing ; and those who can suppose that such a service was acceptable to God, or available for the happiness of the deceased sovereign, had they lived in the days of Ahab and Jezebel, must have joined with the worshippers of Baal, in calling upon the idol from morning to night, in the same words O Baal, hear us.

Hoc est corpus meum, are the grand mysterious words which are used in every mass, and which produce the miraculous effects for which the mass is celebrated. The continual saying of masses is therefore little more than an incessant repetition of these words, which, though they be a translation of the words which Christ used, in instituting the ordinance of the supper, being thus prostituted to an idolatrous and superstitious use, are no better than a mere heathenish incantation ; and the priest who can deliberately impose upon the credulity of kings and queens, or of persons of any rank, by making them believe that by such means they can do good to the souls of those who are dead, must be regarded as the most depraved agents of the prince of darkness. Their’s is not only a service which God has not required ; but it is absolutely incompatible with that reasonable and spiritual worship which is ordained in the New Testament ; and inconsistent with all that is there revealed of the way by which a sinner is saved, and by which he draws near to God with the hope of being accepted.

The grand point to which every thing in the system of Popery tends, is to get money, insomuch, that one is led to imagine that the Pope is no other than an incarnation of the ancient idol, Mammon, and that the priests are his tax-gatherers. The following abstract of a sermon on purgatory shows how little account is made by the priests of what, even by their own statement, should appear the most important branches of the doctrine, and how naturally they run on to expatiate upon that branch that brings in the money.

"I went once to hear an old friar, who had the name of an excellent preacher, upon the subject of the souls in purgatory, and he took his text out of the 21st chapter of the Apocalypse, 27th verse; "And there shall in no wise enter into it any thing that defileth," &c; by which he settled the belief of purgatory, proving by some romantic authority, that such a passage ought to be understood of purgatory, and his chief authority was, because a famous interpreter renders the text thus: There shall not enter into it (meaning heaven) any thing which is not proved by the fire, as silver is purified by it. When he had proved his text, he came to divide it, which he did in these three heads. First, That the souls suffer in purgatory three sorts of torments, of which the first was fire, and that greater than that of hell. Secondly, To be deprived of the face of God. And thirdly, Which was the greatest of all the torments, to see their relations and friends here on earth diverting themselves, and taking so little care to relieve them out of these terrible pains. The preacher spoke very little of the two first points, but he insisted upon the third a long hour, taxing the people of ingratitude and inhumanity; and that if it was possible for any of the living to experience only for a moment, that devouring flame of purgatory, certainly he would come again, and sell whatever he had in the world, and give it for masses: and what pity it is, said he, to know that there are the souls of many of my hearers' relations there, and none of them endeavour to relieve them out of that place. He went on, and said, I have a catalogue of the souls, which by revelation and apparition, we are sure are in purgatory; for in the first place, the soul of such a one, (meaning a rich merchant's father) did appear the other night to a godly person, in a figure of a pig, and the devout person knowing that the door of his chamber was locked up, began to sprinkle the pig with holy water, and conjuring him, bade him speak, and tell what he wanted? And the pig said, I am the soul of such a one, and I have been in purgatory these ten years for want of help. When I left the world, I forgot to tell my confessor where I left 1000 pistoles, which I had reserved for masses. My son found them out, and he is such an unnatural child that he doth not remember my pitiful condition;

and now, by the permission of heaven, I come to you, and command-you to discover this case to the first preacher you meet, that he may publish it, and tell my son, that if he doth not give that money for masses for my relief, I shall be for ever in purgatory, and his soul shall certainly go to hell.

“The sottish merchant, terrified with this story, got up before all the people and went into the vestry, and when the friar had finished, he begged of him to go with him to his house, where he should receive the money, which he did accordingly, for fear of second thought; and the merchant freely gave the 1000 pistoles, for fear that his father should be kept in purgatory, and he himself go to hell.” *Master Key, Vol. I. pp. 173—175.* Mr. Gavin does not tell us how the friar came to know the fact that the young man had found a sum of money which had been secreted by his father; but there will appear to have been no need of a supernatural revelation, when it is recollected that every father confessor has access to know all the secrets of all his spiritual children; and these fathers can easily make known to one another, any secret which they think will serve the common cause.

It is a common thing, at this very day, for Papists in Ireland to leave large sums of money, to be applied after their death, for the relief of their souls. It had been found that great abuses existed with regard to the management of charitable bequests in general, in that kingdom. On which account an act was passed in the third year, and another in the fortieth year of his present Majesty, by which “every executor of a will is bound under a penalty of £50 to give notice in the Dublin Gazette, within three months after obtaining probate, of every charitable bequest contained in the will of the deceased, whether he was of the Protestant or Roman Catholic religion, in order that money left for charitable purposes may not be concealed and embezzled.” The Commissioners, under this Act, are the highest dignitaries of both Church and State in Ireland; and in their records, the following items appear:—

“1801.—The Rev. Matt. Lennon, Titular Bishop of Dro-more, bequeathed £500, to purchase six Government Debentures, for the purpose of establishing a daily mass for his soul, in the chapel of Newry, in perpetuance.” 1803.—The Rev. Edanus Murphy, a parish priest, in the county of Wexford, bequeathed all his books and household furniture, and what stock he might have at the time of his decease, to his Nephew, the Rev. William Stafford, *to be laid out for suffrages for his soul.*” Same year, “Patrick Darcy, of Bishop-street, Dublin, left an annuity of L.3 : 8 : 3, per annum, to the clergymen of Francis-street chapel, for saying *soul masses*, for the space of thirty-five

years."—"In the same year, Mrs. French left a sum of money to say masses for her soul, and the souls of her two husbands." 1805.—"The Rev. W. Lonergan, parish priest of Carrickbeg, county of Wexford, left in this year, *L.10* to the chapel of Carrickbeg, and *L.5* to Ballindesart chapel, and *L.100* to his burial, *mourths mind*, and *masses*, the masses at one shilling and sevenpence per mass." See a *Refutation of the Statement of the Penal Laws, which aggrieve the Catholics of Ireland, Dublin, 1812*. This work contains many other such instances of superstition; but the above, I think, are enough for a sample.

This author informs us, that "although, since the days of Lord Coke, money left to say masses for a soul, has been declared to be an unlawful and superstitious bequest, yet the Commissioners have never molested the Rev. Matthew Lennon's executors, nor even prosecuted them for not advertising his bequests." The fact is, that the utmost tenderness, and the most liberal indulgence is shown to Papists in all these matters; so that they have no reason whatever to complain of any hardship being imposed upon them; and yet, if we were to take the word of their political writers, they are suffering more cruel persecution than the children of Israel did in Egypt.

The editor of the Antijacobin Review, and Protestant Advocate, has done me the honour of inserting in his Number for last month, my tenth Number entire, that is, the sixteenth of the Dublin edition. He introduces it with a paragraph, in which he says, "Whilst Glasgow has produced a layman to vindicate Christianity from its worst foes, and Ireland can boast of many, even martyrs, as well as defenders of her church, *not a single publication against Popery from the Lancashire press, is known to the world.*" The editor has not seen the excellent volume of the Rev. Mr. Fletcher of Blackburn, which was printed in Manchester, in 1817, and is, I am informed, now reprinting in London. It is entitled "Lectures on the Principles and Institutions of the Roman Catholic Religion." I take this opportunity of respectfully recommending it to the "PROTESTANT ADVOCATE," and to all my readers. The worst fault of it is, that it is too good for the persons the author has to deal with. He concedes too much in the way of liberality and politeness; these being qualities which Papists can neither appreciate nor imitate, when engaged in controversy about their religion.

THE

Protestant,

No. LXXIX.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 15th, 1820.

IT is now time to discuss the subject of purgatory more seriously than I have yet done. The thing, indeed, is connected with so many ludicrous associations, that it is not easy to treat it seriously; but when we consider that it is one of the chief instruments by which the people are deceived, and by which the Church of Rome has her wealth, it will appear proper and necessary that the imposition be exposed, and the truth of the gospel maintained.

There is nothing declared more plainly in the Bible, than that Christ came into the world to save sinners. It is declared with equal plainness,—“He that believeth on the Son, hath everlasting life, and shall never come into condemnation; but he that believeth not the Son, shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth on him,” John iii. 36. He that believes in Christ is a justified person, and when he dies he is received immediately into heaven. “There is no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus,” Rom. viii. 1. The Apostle speaks in language of strong defiance: “Who shall lay *any thing* to the charge of God’s elect,” *ver.* 33. This is as much as to say, that nothing whatever stands against them. The salvation which they have in Christ, is a complete salvation: it is a forgiveness of all trespasses, absolutely and for ever. The Bible does not contain the slightest hint, that there are some trespasses not forgiven to a genuine Christian, and for which he must make satisfaction in his own person, in this world, or in the world to come, or in a state between the one and the other.

Besides, we learn from the word of God, that it is in this life only that men become interested in the salvation of Christ. The state in which death finds a man, will be his state for ever. If he be in a state of peace with God at the moment of his death,

he enters into peace; he rests from his labours and from his sufferings. Dying in the Lord, as every believer does, is to die in a state of acceptance and favour, which is quite inconsistent with the idea of undergoing ages, or even years of punishment. The greatest sinners, believing in Christ, are declared to be washed, and sanctified, and justified, in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God, 1 Cor. vi. 11. This renders all other purification unnecessary; and the idea of a purgatorial fire for purifying the souls of Christians, cannot be entertained, without condemning, as insufficient, the blood of Christ and the work of the Holy Spirit. This contempt is, indeed, inseparable from the doctrine of purgatory. He that teaches that a man must make satisfaction for his own sins, in whole or in part, declares the insufficiency of the satisfaction which Christ has made; and he who expects to be purified in the fire of purgatory, is guilty of despising the sanctifying influence of the Holy Ghost.

The Council of Trent do not profess to adduce any higher authority than their own for this doctrine. They had not the presumption; great as their presumption was, to father such an absurdity upon the Bible. With Papists, indeed, their authority will be held as good as that of the word of God; but with Protestants it has no more weight than the reveries of Mahomet,—I might satisfy myself with merely asserting, that there is no such place. As, however, some Popish writers of great name have attempted to prove the doctrine from Scripture, I shall now proceed to examine more particularly their Scripture proofs.

In “the grounds of the Catholic doctrine, contained in the profession of faith, published by Pope Pius IV.,” we have what is meant for an argument from Scripture, on behalf of purgatory, as follows:—“The Scripture in many places assures us, that ‘God will render to every man according to his works,’ Ps. xii. v. 12. Mat. xvi. v. 27. Rom. ii. v. 6. Rev. xxii. v. 12. Now this would not be true, if there were no such thing as purgatory; for how could God render to every one according to his works, if such as die in the guilt of any, even the least sin, which they have not taken care to blot out by repentance, would nevertheless go straight to heaven?” It is undoubtedly true, that “God will render to every man according to his works:” and the Church of Rome gives a pretty fair specimen of her impudence, by saying, “this would not be true, but for her purgatory.” Such declarations of Scripture have, in reality, nothing to do with purgatory. If men “die in the guilt of any, even the least sin,” the Bible tells us plainly, they must perish, and that for ever. “God will render unto them according to their

works;" that is, he will render indignation and wrath, tribulation and anguish upon every soul of man that doeth evil. Such go away into everlasting punishment. This is called the blackness of darkness for ever. But we have not the slightest hint, in the whole Bible, that such persons go into a place of temporary punishment, out of which they shall be released, sooner or later, as their friends on earth shall be pleased to pay money for their relief.

Those who die in Christ, do not "die in the guilt of any, even the least sin;" because in virtue of his atoning sacrifice, all their sins, without the exception of the very least, are taken away. "God made him who knew no sin, to be sin for us," says one Apostle, "that we might be made the righteousness of God in him," 2 Cor. v. 21. Christ's righteousness imputed to the believer of the gospel, constitutes him righteous before God. Thus "Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness." Now it was not written for his sake alone, that it was imputed to him; but for us also, to whom it shall be imputed, if we believe in him who raised up Jesus our Lord from the dead; "who was delivered for our offences, and raised again for our justification." Rom. iv. 3. 23—25. We learn from such declarations as these, that every real Christian is a justified person; that he has received a full acquittal and remission of all his sins; and the same Apostle cites the Psalmist, as describing the blessedness of the man to whom the Lord will not impute sin. It is not said, the man who hath not committed sin, for there is no such man in the world, or ever shall be; but the man to whom sin shall not be imputed; who has it not charged against him for future reckoning; who shall not be punished as his sins deserve. The standing of such a man before God, is not in himself, but in Christ his Saviour; hence his blessedness and security. If his standing were in himself, he would most certainly fall, and incur not the temporary punishment of purgatory, but the pains of hell for ever.

Now, it is true also of such a man, that God will render to him according to his works. When the earth and the sea shall give up the dead which are in them, every man shall be judged according to his works. The judgment of the great day, like that of every well constituted human tribunal, will proceed according to evidence. A man's works are the evidence of his state before God. Those who have done nothing but evil, will have their evil deeds produced as evidence against them; shall be judged according to their works, and receive the condemnation which they deserve. Those who believe in Christ, are created anew to good works. They, and they only, really serve God in this world; their services, as well as their persons, are

accepted for Christ's sake, not for any value in them; and according to these the judgment shall proceed. Not that there is such merit in their works as to deserve a reward; but because they evince a relation to Christ, who alone has merited eternal life, and who is the author of it to all them that obey him. There is a broad and intelligible distinction between the expressions *according to works*, and *on account of works*, just as there is between the evidence of a witness and the fact which it is brought to establish. The just sentence of any court will be according to evidence, but the evidence is not that *on account of* which, or for the sake of which, a man is rewarded or condemned. The wicked shall indeed be condemned and punished *on account of* their works; but not as viewed in the character of evidence, but as acts of rebellion against God. The reward of the righteous will be according to their works, but solely *on account of* Christ's perfect righteousness, in which they become interested by faith; and, but for which, they would never have had any good works to exhibit.

But, here I ask again, what have we to do with purgatory? The passages of Scripture under consideration, speak of God rendering to men *according to their works*; but it is plainly avowed by Papists themselves, that the rendering to men in purgatory, is not according to their works, but *according to their wealth*; or, according to the wealth of their surviving friends. They speak with great solemnity, when they choose to be serious, of God requiring punishment for the guilt of the least sin; and yet they do most blasphemously represent Him as relaxing such punishment, or remitting it altogether, on condition of certain sums of money being paid to the priests for masses. By the more grave and sensible of their doctors, the punishment of purgatory is represented to be salutary and necessary, in order to qualify persons for heaven; and yet they may be exempted from that salutary and purifying process, on payment of money by their friends. It is declared by all the Romish doctors who write on the subject, that without the purgatorian fire, men cannot go to heaven; yet money can purchase exemption from this fire, or mitigate its pains. What is this, but to teach that money can open the gate of heaven? or, that money can procure admittance for persons who have not undergone the necessary purification? Now, suppose for a moment, that this has taken place. Suppose that a man who had led a most wicked life, had died without repentance; or, to use the words of my Popish author, had "not taken care to blot out by repentance," the guilt of any, even the least sin,—suppose, I say, such a person to go to purgatory, in order to be purified, and made meet for heaven, would it not be a most cruel thing to interrupt the process of purifica-

tion, and to force his passage through the fire, before it had produced its full effect upon him? This would be in reality to force the man into heaven before he was fit for it, and to such a man it would be no heaven, but a place of punishment, equal to all that Papists have fancied of their purgatory.

I know it will be answered, that God is pleased, in consideration of a certain number of masses, for which a sum of money must be paid, to mitigate the rigour of the punishment of souls in purgatory, and remit so much of the debt that is due. But what then becomes of his justice, which is declared to be so inflexible as not to remit the punishment of the least sin without satisfaction? It comes inevitably to this, that Papists consider God to be such a one as themselves, who will consent to any thing for money. The idea is so horribly impious, that I scarcely know how to write it; and yet it is inseparable from the doctrine of purgatory, and the remission of its pains, in consideration of money paid to the priests for masses, which masses are declared to have so much virtue, as to procure a remission or mitigation of those pains which the justice of God had imposed on account of sin.

His Holiness, Pope Pius IV., adduces the following words, (Mat. v. 25, 26.) to prove his doctrine of purgatory: "Agree with thine adversary quickly, whilst thou art in the way with him: lest at any time the adversary deliver thee to the judge, and the judge deliver thee to the officer, and thou be cast into prison. Verily, I say unto thee, thou shalt by no means come out thence, till thou hast paid the uttermost farthing.—Which text, St. Cyprian, one of the ancient fathers, understands of the prison of purgatory, *Epist. 52. ad Antonianum.*" But what if St. Cyprian was mistaken in his application of this passage? Why, then, this proof must fall to the ground, for there is no other authority produced in support of this view of its meaning. Suppose St. Cyprian to be right in his application of the words, they will be found most effectually to destroy the whole traffic of our purgatory priests. To a person who is in danger of being thrust into the prison, it is said expressly; "Verily, I say unto THEE, thou shalt BY NO MEANS come out thence, till THOU hast paid the uttermost farthing." This admits of no commutation of punishment. The sinner must pay the whole debt in his own person. The priests promise deliverance by *means* of masses and money; but, No, says the text, he shall come out by no means, but by himself paying the uttermost farthing; that is, suffering the full measure of punishment in his own person. The Douay doctors were too wise to introduce this passage of Scripture to prove the doctrine of purgatory, seeing no doubt that it would spoil their trade; and yet the infallible head of the Church of Rome, had not the

sagacity to perceive, that if a soul would be delivered from purgatory by *no means*, all the means of his appointment were vain.

It does not properly belong to my plan to give the true meaning of every passage of Scripture which Papists pervert. It is enough for my purpose to shew that a passage does not contain what they affect to find in it ; but lest they should think themselves entitled to claim this passage as an unanswerable argument on their side, I shall endeavour, in as few words as possible, to show its real meaning ; which, indeed, any reader of ordinary understanding may find out, if he will read with attention the whole passage from the 21st verse ; and a person can scarcely be sure of the meaning of any passage, unless he read it entire, without regard to the breaks which are made by verses, and sometimes even by chapters. Christ was speaking of unjust anger, provoking speeches and quarrels, among brethren. He declares that for one rash expression (thou fool) a man should be in danger of hell fire. He says, " If thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath ought against thee, leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way, first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift." A man conscious of having given his brother cause of offence was not in a state of mind to offer an acceptable sacrifice. He is therefore commanded to take immediate steps for reconciliation ; and it is in this connexion that our Lord adds, " agree with thine adversary quickly whilst thou art in the way with him," &c ; meaning that if this is not done, he may expect that his adversary will take summary and severe vengeance when he shall have it in his power. But I doubt not, the words are chiefly intended to convey spiritual instruction. An irreconcilable state of mind towards a brother whom one has offended, indicates a mind at enmity against God. Unless such a one shall become reconciled, and make this evident by becoming reconciled to his brother, he is in danger of eternal punishment, from which he shall not be delivered, but which he must suffer to the uttermost.

The same Pope Pius IV. the infallible head of what is improperly called the Catholic Church, introduces his pretended ancestor, the Apostle Peter, as a believer in purgatory, and a teacher of the doctrine. He refers to his first Epistle, iii. 18—20, " Where Christ is said by his Spirit, to have gone and preached to the spirits in prison, which sometime were disobedient, &c. Which prison," says he, " could be no other than purgatory : for as to the spirits that were in the prison of hell, Christ certainly did not go to preach to them." What his Holiness thus declares, " certainly," is not very consistent with the explanation which other Popish writers give of a clause in what they call the " Apostles' Creed ;" namely, " He descended into hell ;" for they sup-

pose that Christ literally went into hell for the purpose of delivering souls out of it, or for some other purpose which they could not well define, but upon the supposition that he went to preach to the spirits which were there in prison.

But I request my readers to attend to the statement of the inspired Apostle, in connection with the narrative of the inspired historian, Genesis vi and vii, and they will find that there is no more of purgatory in it, than in the other passages of Scripture which have been adduced. God saw that the wickedness of man was great upon the earth, and he declared his purpose to destroy the world by a flood. But he raised up Noah, who was a preacher of righteousness. During the long period of a hundred and twenty years, while the ark was a-building, Noah was employed in preaching the righteousness of the promised Saviour as the only ground of hope for sinners; and while he and his sons were building the ark, they were giving a visible evidence of the divine displeasure against the human race on account of sin; and at the same time preaching the evangelical truth, that there was no way of escape but that which God had appointed. It was the Spirit of Christ which spoke by all the Prophets (1. Pet. i. 11.) and by Enoch and Noah among the rest. It was therefore Christ who, by his Spirit, went and preached to the spirits in prison (that is, who are now in prison,) and who were disobedient in the days of Noah, while the ark was a-preparing. By the ministry of Noah, Christ, by his Spirit, preached to them the righteousness on the footing of which alone they could be saved; and he exhibited the ark then a-building, as a type of the security of all who should flee to him for refuge; but the great bulk of the people were disobedient; they did not believe the preaching; they did not flee for refuge to the hope set before them; therefore, they perished in their sins, and were, at the time when the Apostle wrote, shut up in the prison of hell, where they should ever remain.

But I must not overlook one great argument which Papists profess to derive from Scripture in support of their doctrine of purgatory. It is from 2 Maccabees chap. xii. in which we are told "that money was sent to Jerusalem, that sacrifices might be offered for the slain; and it is recommended as a holy cogitation, to pray for the dead." Bellarmine ranks this in the front of his Scripture proofs; and the great Mr. Gother, the oracle of English Papists, also gives it the first place in his true representation of the Popish doctrine on this head, as a conclusive evidence; adding, that "these two books of Maccabees were certainly held in great veneration by all antiquity."

But in point of fact, the books called Maccabees have no more authority in religious matters than those of Bellarmine or Gother themselves. The books called Apocrypha, which are sometimes.

very improperly, I think, bound up with our Bibles, were never received by the Jewish church as of divine authority. They formed no part of that volume to which Christ and his Apostles so often referred, under the title of Moses and the Prophets. There is scarcely a book, or a section of a book, in the Old Testament, which is not quoted or referred to in some passage of the New Testament. Christ has thus given the sanction of his authority to Moses, and the Psalms, and the Prophets; that is, to the whole volume of Scripture which the Jews had received from Moses and the Prophets; which they most tenaciously maintained as canonical; and which is known by us under the title of the Old Testament. But there was not one of the Apocryphal books so acknowledged by the Jews, or so referred to by Christ and his Apostles. It was not till the time of the council of Trent that these books were authoritatively declared to be of equal authority with the Old and New Testament; and it was not in the power of that holy, or more properly insolent assembly, to give a satisfactory reason for their investing, with divine authority, those books which had not been received as canonical by the primitive churches,—whose authors did not profess to be divinely inspired; and who, in many instances, make it evident that they were fallible men. The writer of the book from which the learned Cardinals, and the great Representer, draw their front argument for purgatory, confesses, in the following words, that he wrote merely like other authors of works merely human. He makes an apology for his imperfections as an author, which no inspired writer ever did; and he bespeaks the good opinion of his readers on the plea that he had done his best. “Here,” says he, “will I make an end. And if I have done well, and as is fitting the story, it is that which I desired; but if slenderly and meanly, it is that which I could attain unto. For as it is hurtful to drink wine or water alone; and as wine mingled with water is pleasant, and delighteth the taste; even so speech finely framed delighteth the ears of them that read the story. And here shall be an end.” 2 Maccab. xv. 37—39.

Besides the pedantic quaintness of this extract, it contains not a little absurdity. Who was ever hurt by drinking water alone, if he was in a temperate state of body? and what harm can result from drinking wine alone, if it be done with moderation? But the point which I wish to keep principally in view is, the explicit disavowal of divine inspiration which is clearly implied in the author's own words; and yet it is upon the words of such an author that the holy and infallible Church of Rome grounds her principal argument in support of her doctrine of purgatory, and prayers for the dead.

Protestant,

No. LXXX.

SATURDAY, JANUARY 22d, 1820.

I HAVE now examined the principal Scripture authorities on which Papists profess to found their doctrine of purgatory, and I have shown that no such doctrine is contained in them. There is not a passage in the whole Bible, that gives the slightest countenance to the Church of Rome's intermediate state between this world and the next; but the whole tenor of the Bible teaches, that the state in which death finds a man, shall be his state for ever. The washing of regeneration, and the renewing of the Holy Ghost, must take place in the present life, if it take place at all and he who is not renewed in the spirit of his mind before his death, cannot be renewed afterwards. It is life eternal to know the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom he hath sent; but such knowledge must be imparted in the present life, else it cannot be imparted:—"There is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom in the grave."

Had there been such a state as purgatory, it would surely have been mentioned in Scripture; and we can scarcely imagine an occasion more proper for the mention of it, than in the parable of the rich man and Lazarus, Luke xvi. 22, 23. "Lazarus died, and was carried by angels into Abraham's bosom." He was neither an apostle, nor a martyr, nor a *saint*, in Popish estimation. There is no evidence of his having punished himself by stripes, or voluntary austerities of any kind. It is not said that *he* had made satisfaction to divine justice for any, even the least of his sins; but being a vessel of mercy, washed and sanctified, and justified, in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God, he had no need of any other purification: accordingly, he was not sent by any such circuitous rout, but was instantly, on his death, received into heaven. Every real Christian is justified by the same righteousness, and sanctified by the same influence, and has no more occasion to pass through purgatory than Lazarus had.

“ The rich man also died, and was buried ; and in hell he lifted up his eyes, being in torments.” There is no mention of a middle state, in which he might be purified and made meet for heaven ; and yet upon the supposition that there was such a place as purgatory, no good reason can be given why this man should not have had the benefit of it ; that is, the favour of being punished and purged there, without going to hell at all. He was not a heretic, or an excommunicated person. He was a son of Abraham. This constituted him a member of the visible church, as really as baptism can declare one to be a Christian ; and there is nothing worse said of him, than what may truly be said of many baptized persons in the Church of Rome, and in Reformed Churches. Why, then, should not he have had the benefit of purgatory ? Because there is no such place,—because there is no means provided in heaven, or earth, or hell, or any where else, for purifying a soul that dies under the guilt of sin. Supposing the soul of the rich man to have been in purgatory, and Abraham to have been like the Pope, or even an inferior priest, he would have said, I will send notice to thy five brethren on earth, who inherit thy wealth, that they order so many thousand masses to be said for thy relief, and pay the priests handsomely, and thy soul shall soon be with me. It is wrong to speak with levity on a subject of such awful importance ; but seriously, this is in the true spirit of Popery. Our Saviour, however, teaches by the language which he ascribes to Abraham, that there was a great gulf between the place of happiness, and the place of punishment, and that it was not possible to pass from the one to the other.

There are many absurdities, as well as much impiety, connected with the doctrine of purgatory. In addition to what I have already exhibited, I present the reader with the following, for which, I am indebted to a gentleman of this city, who was an eye witness of what he describes :—

“ TO THE PROTESTANT.

Glasgow, 10th January, 1820.

DEAR SIR,

In discussing the subject of purgatory in your late Numbers, and the various ways in which the priests contrive to extort money from their people, under pretence of getting the souls of their departed friends released from that imaginary place of temporary punishment, I do not observe that you have noticed the custom prevalent in Ireland, (and no doubt in other Catholic countries) of making contributions for that purpose at funerals.—Previous to the procession, mass is performed for the soul of the deceased, immediately after which, the priest begins to collect

money from the persons assembled. This is done very much after the manner of an auctioneer, in the act of selling a property at the hammer; and the term *canting*, by which the practice is universally designated in Ireland, bears precisely the same meaning as does that of *rouping*, in Scotland. The priest commences by saying, "Who gives for the soul of the faithful departed?" a metal trencher being placed on the coffin. The persons nearest then throw in their offerings, and the others follow by degrees as they can get forward. To whoever gives sixpence, the priest says, "God bless you!" To those who give a shilling, or more, he usually says "God *Almighty* bless you!" Those who give merely copper, pass unnoticed. As the clanging sound of the trencher becomes less frequent, the priest becomes more importunate to have it prolonged:—he vociferates often and rapidly, "Who will give more for the soul of the faithful departed?" Some of those who had previously contributed, make an addition, and others, determined not to be outdone in this pious and public manner of testifying the respect they entertained for the deceased, follow the example; while the former, stimulated by the continued clamour of the priest, give a third time. The priest goes on vociferating, "Will nobody give more for the soul of the faithful departed?" "Oh, will no one give more!" until this greedy clamour wholly ceases to be of farther avail. I need hardly add, that he then completes the pious fraud by coolly pocketing the money.

"This exhibition is by no means confined to the dwelling-houses of the deceased; or at least, was not so when I was last in Ireland, about seventeen years ago. It was frequently practised on the highway leading to the church-yard, or on the burying ground itself. The purpose of this, is of course to get more money, by means of the increased number of persons who are usually present out of doors. In Ireland, no funeral invitations are issued by the poorer classes, it being understood, that all who respected the deceased in his lifetime, will attend without any; and the number who join the procession as it passes along the road, is much greater than that which assembles at the house of the deceased. Hence, at the period I allude to, it was customary for the priest to stop the procession, (before which he marched singly, with a white band about his hat, and a book in his hand,) whenever he conceived the assemblage to be at its greatest. I was present at one of these public cantings, in the neighbourhood of Lurgan, in the county of Armagh, in the year 1802, when the coffin having been taken from the hearse and laid on the road, a few hundred yards before coming to the burial ground, the process which I have described took place, in presence of an immense multitude.—I am, &c."

I shall conclude the subject of purgatory, with the following hand-bill, or card of invitation to the members of the Purgatorian Society in Dublin, calling them to perform the duties, and enjoy the privileges of members; that is, of those who pay a penny a-week for the relief of suffering souls.—The date, the day, and the hour of meeting, are in writing; the rest is neatly printed.

SOCIETY OF ST. JOHN,

THE EVANGELIST,

For promoting the Exercise of the Spiritual and Corporal Works of Mercy.

~~~~~  
 "Let us not love in Word, nor in Tongue, but in Deed and in Truth." 1 John 10 ch. 18 v. \*

~~~~~  
 "As a Member of this Society, you are prayed to assist at the Quarterly Solemn Office and High Mass, which will be celebrated in St. Michael's, and St. John's Chapel, on Wednesday next, at 11 o'Clock, for the Suffering Souls in Purgatory, and particularly for the Deceased Subscribers, and the Parents, Friends, and Relations of the Subscribers to this Society.

M. BLAKE, President."

19th day of June, 1819.

~~~~~  
 J. COYNE, Printer, 74, Cook-st.

Before proceeding to another general subject of discussion, I shall, according to custom, introduce a variety of lighter matter, to relieve the reader's mind from the gloom that may have been occasioned by dwelling so long on purgatory.

My readers, I suppose, will almost have forgotten, that there was a work printed in London, meant as a reply to THE PROTESTANT, under the title of THE CATHOLIC VINDICATOR. It is about six months since I had last occasion to allude to this work; and now I find it has been given up. This, I confess, is a disappointment to me; and the first disappointment of any importance that I have met with since the commencement of my labours; for the author was such a man of words, that I had made up my mind to concede to him the last word, though I should have written for seven years. Besides, I considered him a very useful auxiliary, in exposing the absurdities and impieties of the Church of Rome, which he did very effectually, by seriously maintaining them; and he exemplified, in every page, the true spirit of Popery, with a force and propriety which no Protestant could imitate, or even properly describe.

---

\* The reader will look in vain for such a chapter and verse in the common English Bible.



I took some notice of him once and again, in my first volume. Every such notice, served him as a bone to gnaw for a week or two; but since I ceased to take any notice of him at all, he has gone on raging and foaming like a mad dog, but happily much more harmless; and in this state of rage and madness, he made his exit about six weeks ago.

It was indeed, evident, long before this, that he was in a declining state. Persons even of his own communion, had become sick of the incessant repetition of his ultra Billingsgate, without a particle of reason or common sense; and though he was actually their hired champion, they wished him to have done, partly because they were ashamed of him, but chiefly because they were obliged to pay him for the full tale of every Number of his work, of which they were not able to sell much above one tenth, and lately I have been told, not even so much.

I speak only from a current report of the trade, for I never thought it worth while to institute an inquiry into a matter of so little importance to the cause which I am pleading; but I have heard as a matter of report, which hundreds have done, that our Glasgow Papists became bound to Mr. Andrews, to pay him his price for a certain number of copies of his *Vindicator*, and to take the risk of their sale; and that this engagement was to continue for about a year. The half of the year had not expired, when the dupes of this man of words, found that they had made a bad bargain, and wished to be quit; but he kept them strictly to the terms of their agreement. They had to bear both the "skaith and the scorn." The few who continued to read the *Vindicator*, were laughing at their folly; and they were compelled to pay for whole reams, nay, I may say bales, of what was no better than waste-paper.

Every effort that man could make, was made to promote the sale. No book was ever so much exposed to public view in Glasgow, as *THE CATHOLIC VINDICATOR*, of which the corners of our streets bear witness to this day. The placarding, however, ceased some weeks before the work itself expired. About three months ago, some wicked wag, going along the streets, had chalked 666, the well-known Number of the Beast, upon a number of the *Vindicator's* great blue hand-bills. Our Papists, it seems, were wise enough to understand the allusion, or some Protestant must have told them what the figures meant; for they did not choose to expose themselves again to such an affront. From that time they ceased their placarding; and the tattered fragments of old hand-bills remaining upon our walls, are the principal evidence that such a work ever existed.

It was very evident from these circumstances, especially from the want of sale, that the work was expiring; and it was indeed, given out long ago, that the fifty-second Number was to be the last. The fifty-second did announce itself to be the last Number;

but for what reason? Not because the author had disgusted all his readers, by answering his opponent with nothing but bad names, and false assertions. Not because his Numbers would not sell, and his friends were robbed of their money, by being obliged to pay for them, and would submit to the robbery no longer than they were bound by their foolish engagement. None of these causes must be assigned for the termination of the *Vindicator's important labours*. In short, the truth must not be told, as it would be disreputable to the cause of Popery; and he whose life is employed in propagating falsehood, is in great danger of expiring with a lie in his mouth. I hope the literary *defunct*, as well as his correspondents and dupes in Glasgow, will understand what I mean.

The new tax upon periodical publications, is assigned by Mr. Andrews as the cause, and the only cause of his abandoning his defence of the Church of Rome, against the attacks of **THE PROTESTANT**. But the falsehood of this is evident, from the fact, that he actually brought his work to a close several weeks before the Act imposing such a tax was passed, and when he could not know whether it would pass or not. The Number which finishes his labours, and in which he gives his reason for their termination, is dated December 4th. The bill did not pass the House of Lords, till the 30th of that month; and it was not to take effect till ten days thereafter. If, therefore, he had not been quite exhausted,—if he had had any thing more to say in defence of his holy and infallible church,—had he been able to invent any more bad names, or any more accusations of forgery against **THE PROTESTANT**, he might have had at least five additional Numbers; and, perhaps, exhausted though he was, he would have found means by repeating five times more, what he had already repeated fifty times, to make up so many more pages, had he believed that any body would buy them.

Since the 10th of this month, indeed, periodical publications of a certain description, have become subject to a tax; but this would not have affected Mr. Andrews' publication any more than mine, had he been pleased to continue it, and to confine himself to a defence of his religion, without abusing our Protestant government. This new tax, however, was proposed at a time most favourable for him; and he took advantage of the very proposal in order to cover his retreat, and conceal the shame of his not being able to continue the controversy any longer. He retires under the cover of a falsehood; but this is a matter of no importance with Papists. With them the question with regard to any matter, is not whether it be true, but whether it will serve any desirable purpose?

I must not be understood as yet entering upon a reply to **THE CATHOLIC VINDICATOR**. I am only honouring his demise with

a passing compliment. He laboured a whole year with scarcely any other view, than to divert me from the exposure of the wickedness of Popery, on which he saw I was bent; and not being able to accomplish his object, he was not able to survive the disappointment.

The same policy has been followed by Popish writers, ever since the Reformation. Whenever an author appeared to oppose any doctrine or practice of the Church of Rome, the literati of that church, set themselves not so much to defend what was attacked, as to divert the assailant to some other point; and in general they were successful in leading him entirely away from the question originally at issue. On this subject, the following remarks of Dr. Campbell, are strikingly just:—"When a man enters keenly into controversy on any subject, it is impossible to say, (unless he is uncommonly circumspect) how far it may carry him. It generally leads to the discussion of questions little connected with that which began the dispute. In this warfare, a man is so much at the mercy of his antagonist, that if he enter into it with more warmth than circumspection, he will follow his enemy that he may fight him, wheresoever he shall shelter himself; and in this way both combatants come to be soon off the ground on which the combat began. Exactly such a disputant was Luther. And this may be said in a great measure of all who had a leading hand in the Reformation. To conquer the foe, wherever he was, came, ere they were aware, to be more an object to them, than to drive them off the field, and keep possession of it. In consequence of this tendency, they were often diverted from their object." *Lect. Ecc. Hist. Lect. xxviii.*

If it were lawful to indulge in self-gratulation, I would congratulate myself on having been enabled to avoid the snare into which Luther and other Reformers fell: And certainly it was not more artfully laid for them than it was laid for me. AMICUS VERITATIS, perceiving that I was determined to expose some of the errors of his church, threw out a host of accusations against Luther, and the other Reformers, expecting, no doubt, that I would immediately enter upon their defence, and let the errors of his church alone. When the VINDICATOR made his appearance, he took precisely the same method; and, in addition, he began a course of scurrilous abuse against myself personally, which he continued through every page of his work. He brought such accusations as he supposed no man could bear. He asserted falsehoods, and made blunders so palpable—many of them, I believe, purposely made so, that he might tempt me to follow him into the labyrinth which he had prepared for me, knowing, that if he got me once seduced to follow, him I would not easily get back to the point from which I had started. Had I yielded to the temptation, he would have gained his point. He would not have cared how many absurdities and falsehoods

I should have fastened upon him, if he had drawn me away from the exposure of the wickedness of his holy and infallible church.

THE CATHOLIC VINDICATOR set out at first, boasting in his might, engaging, as he said, to measure his strength with THE PROTESTANT, and to "endeavour to bring this champion of the Philistines to the ground." The man was then only putting on his armour, and he did not know that it was not proper for such a one to boast. And though he, whom he calls the "Champion of the Philistines," that is, the advocate of the Protestant religion, is holding his head as erect, and as far from the ground as ever. THE VINDICATOR confidently boasts, in the very last page of his work, when obliged to leave the field, that he has gained the victory. "Nothing more," says he, "I feel convinced, needs be said, to prove my superiority over Mr. William M'Gavin." This, it seems, was what he proposed to himself; and this is what he professes to have gained by his work. Now, this is a point which I never disputed with him; and I hope I will never be so foolish, as to trouble the public with a controversy on the subject of superiority between myself and another man. My business has been to expose error, and maintain the truth; and I desire no victory but that of persuading my opponents to renounce error, and to embrace the truth, that they may be saved.

On looking over what I have just written, I am almost ashamed of having said so much about Mr. Andrews and myself, which will naturally incur the charge of egotism. I hope, however, I shall have no occasion to revert to the subject for months to come. I would be glad, if a more gentlemanly opponent would take up the cause of the Church of Rome, and point out by fair reasoning, any mistake that I have made in my statements, or the inconclusiveness of any of my arguments; for it is a fact, that Mr. Andrews, with all his boasting and bluster, never looked one of my facts or arguments fairly in the face.

These personal matters are, considered in themselves, certainly of very little public importance; but they are not unimportant, when considered as illustrative of the character of Popery. Papists have not been able to meet me on the ground of fair argument; but they have denounced and cursed me from their pulpit, and they have laboured for a whole year, through the medium of their London agent, to hold me up to the world as a monster of wickedness. Now, does any man suppose, that if they had power in their hands, they would be at all this trouble? No, indeed: they would silence opposition at once, by means of the gibbet or the fire; and in doing so, they would not show greater malice than they have already done. It is true, the object of their hatred has suffered as little from their false representations, as from their curses; but this is not from want of good will on their part.

THE

# Protestant,

No. LXXXI.

---

SATURDAY, JANUARY 29th, 1820.

---

I CANNOT but reflect with pleasure on the interest which my work has been honoured to excite in Ireland, of which I have received many flattering testimonies from reverend clergymen, and other gentlemen in that country, whom I never saw, and to whom I am known in no other character, than that of the advocate of the Protestant religion, against the errors and superstitions of Popery. Within a few days, in the early part of this month, I received no less than five copies of the Archbishop of Tuam's charge to his clergy, which were sent to me from different parts of Ireland. The first copy which I received was in manuscript, from a reverend gentleman in the Diocese of Derry; the other copies were contained in Newspapers sent me from different quarters, after the document had appeared in print.

Having communicated this document to the editors of the Glasgow Newspapers, by whom it has been reprinted, I need not insert it here; but I intend to make such extracts from it, and such remarks, as will show that the Romish clergy in Ireland are as hostile to the Bible as ever they were; and that they heartily abhor, and wish to annihilate, the schools which have been established by the Hibernian, and other Societies, for teaching the poor to read the Holy Scriptures.

I cannot introduce this subject better, than by the following communication from a reverend gentleman of that kingdom, well known for his interesting work, the "Annals of Ireland," who has honoured me by his correspondence, and particularly by some fragments of an elegant translation of Buchanan's Franciscan, with which he has been amusing himself in his leisure hours. He has furnished me with the lines in the original Latin; but I shall content myself with giving his short introduction, and his English translation:

“ TO THE EDITOR OF THE PROTESTANT.

“ SIR,

“ As the Popish clergy have uniformly manifested a considerable degree of hostility to the Bible Society, I beg leave to request your insertion of the following passage from *Buchanan's Franciscan*, which may throw some light on the motives which induce these men to endeavour to keep the Holy Scriptures out of the hands of the people. Your readers will please to observe, that the satire, called the *Franciscan*, is written in the manner of Dean Swift's *Advice to Servants*. The satirist advises the Romish priests to do these things which he knows they do, and would expose them for doing.

“ And now, my faithful brethren, once for all,  
I warn all Catholics against Saint Paul ;  
The man of Tarsus, tho' his head lies low,  
Lives in his writing, our eternal foe :—  
Would he had perish'd at an early day,  
Or to Damascus, when he took his way,  
Had dropp'd down dead, before he was baptized,  
And joined the sect he hated and despised.  
Time yet will come, if Prophets tell no lie,  
Who all assure us that it now draws nigh,  
When men, convinc'd by Paul, shall forward stand  
To purge from Superstition all the land—  
From Christian Churches, Heathen Priests expel,  
No longer arbiters of heav'n and hell :—  
Then truth victorious, beaming upon man,  
Shall soon display the Gospel's holy plan ;  
And to the world expose, as clear as day,  
The wiles we practise and the tricks we play.  
Therefore take heed, nor grant to small or great,  
The liberty these writings to translate ;  
And, since we can't destroy them, let them lie,  
Lock'd up in Latin from the vulgar eye—  
Left to be studied and commented on  
By th' orthodox old doctors of Sorbonne,  
Who, when their hoary heads are warm'd with wine,  
Can best unravel mysteries divine.

“ I am, Sir, your constant Reader,

“ J. GRAHAM.

“ *Lifford, Dec. 15th, 1819.*”

Now, in the twentieth year of the nineteenth century, we find a Popish Archbishop in Ireland, acting upon the very principle which the satirist ascribes to the monks of the sixteenth century :—The writings of Paul and the other apostles are, indeed, a great eye-sore to the Church of Rome, of which I furnished abundant proof in my first volume,—Nos. 30 to 38 ; but this charge of the Popish Primate, suggests some new matter, which may not be uninteresting to the reader.

The first reflection excited by it is, that it seems to have been produced in obedience to a mandate issued by the Pope of Rome, addressed to the Irish prelates, on the subject of Bible Schools, for which I refer to the Glasgow Herald of the 7th, and the Glasgow Courier and Chronicle of the 11th of this month. His Holiness is pleased to say to his bishops:—"My Lords, The prediction of our Lord Jesus Christ, in the parable of the sower, that sowed good seed in his field; but while people slept, his enemy came and sowed tares upon the wheat, is, to the very great injury indeed of the Catholic faith, seen verified in these our days, *particularly in Ireland*; for information has reached the ears of the sacred congregation, that "Bible Schools," supported by the funds of the *Heterodox*, (that is, the wrong thinking, meaning, no doubt, the heretical Protestants) have been established in almost every part of Ireland, in which, under the pretence of charity, the inexperienced of both sexes, but particularly peasants and paupers, are deluded by the blandishments, and even gifts of the masters, and infested with the fatal poison of depraved doctrines.

"It is farther stated, that the directors of these schools are, generally speaking, Methodists, who introduce Bibles, translated into English by "the Bible Society," and abounding in errors, with the sole view of seducing the youth, and entirely eradicating from their minds, the truths of the orthodox faith. Under these circumstances, your Lordship already perceives, with what solicitude and attention pastors are bound to watch, and carefully protect their flock from the snares of wolves, who come in the clothing of sheep. If the pastors sleep, the enemy will quickly creep in by stealth, and sow the tares,—soon will the tares be seen growing among the wheat and choke it. Every possible exertion must, therefore, be made to keep the youth away from these destructive schools, to warn parents against suffering their children, on any account whatever, to be let into error. But, for the purpose of escaping the snares of the adversaries, no plan seems more appropriate than the establishing schools, wherein salutary instructions may be imparted to the paupers and illiterate country persons.

"In the name, then, of the bowels (of the mercy) of our Lord Jesus Christ, we exhort and beseech your Lordship to guard your flock with diligence, and with all due discretion, from those persons who are in the habit of thrusting themselves into the fold of Christ, in order thereby to lead the unwary sheep away, and mindful of the forewarning of Peter, the Apostle, given in these words: *viz.* "There shall also be lying teachers among you, who shall bring in sects of perdition," do you labour with all your might to keep the orthodox youth from being corrupted by them, an object which will, I hope, be easily effected by the establishment of Catholic schools throughout your diocese.

“ And confidently trusting, that in a matter of such vast importance, your Lordship will, with unbounded zeal, endeavour to prevent the wheat from being choked by the tares, I pray the All good and omnipotent God, to guard and preserve you safe many years.

“ Your Lordship’s most obedient and humble servant,

“ F. CARDINAL FONTANA, *Prefect*,

“ C. M. PEDICINE, *Secretary*.

Rome, Court of the Sacred Congregation, for the }  
Propagation of the Faith, 18th Sept. 1819.” }

The Archbishop’s charge is little more than an echo and amplification of this letter from the Sacred College at Rome ; but before I proceed to give extracts from this charge, I request the reader’s attention to a few remarks on this *Manifesto* against the Bible, and the schools which teach the reading of it.

In the first place, we have here a direct and avowed interference of the Pope of Rome, in the civil and domestic affairs of the people of Ireland ; and that in opposition to the declared mind of our own Sovereign, and the active endeavours of persons of all ranks, who have avowed their conviction, that the happiness of the people in that kingdom cannot be promoted, without establishing schools for the education of the lower classes. Schools, almost without number, have been established throughout the kingdom. They are supported chiefly by the voluntary contributions of British Protestants, with the Princes of the Royal Family at their head. Those who have the direction of this benevolent undertaking, have introduced the word of God into the schools ; and in doing so, they conceived that they were doing their duty to God and to their fellow creatures. The question, at present, is not whether the Bible be a suitable school-book ? For my own part, I am persuaded there cannot be a better ; but supposing, for the sake of argument, that it were otherwise,—I ask, what has the Pope of Rome to do with it ? The people of Ireland are subjects of his Majesty, King George III., who, many years ago, expressed his wish, “ that every child in his dominions might be able to read the Bible, and have a Bible to read.” The subjects of this venerable Monarch, countenanced by the Princes of his family, are doing what they can in order to accomplish his benevolent desire. They have been wonderfully successful in Ireland ; and because they have been so, the Pope takes the alarm ; he claims the people of Ireland as *his* subjects ; he calls upon his agents, the Romish priests, to obstruct, by every means in their power, what the Sovereign, and the people of Britain, have



considered necessary for the welfare of the inhabitants of that part of the empire. Is it possible, that such insolence,—such an encroachment upon the independence of the British empire, should pass without a solemn universal protest against it?

I know our Papists will reply, that the Pope claims no more than a spiritual authority over his spiritual children; and that he calls upon his bishops only to watch over their spiritual interests: But this, like almost every Popish argument, rests on falsehood. The present interference of the Pope, is, with *schools for education*. The establishment of schools is a civil matter. Teaching children to read, is a civil matter. The appointment of what books shall be read in schools, is a civil matter. It is as secular men that patrons of schools prescribe the reading of the Bible. They cannot add the least influence to its doctrines, and they can add no weight to its authority; but believing it to be the word of God, they hope it will do good to some, and are sure it cannot do harm to any. But supposing they judged erroneously, the Pope has nothing to do with it. It is a matter of civil and domestic arrangement, with which no power, civil or sacred, without the kingdom, has a right to intermeddle.

It has reached the ears of the Sacred Congregation, that “Bible Schools” have been established in almost every part of Ireland: this is the evil which the Pope complains of. It is thus that tares are sown upon the wheat. It is thus that the good seed is in danger of being choked; and it is thus that the people are likely to be infected with the poison of depraved doctrines. Now, it has come to the ears, I suppose, of every “congregation” in Britain, that the Pope has restored the Inquisition, and the order of Jesuits, who are going about sowing their tares, and spreading the poison of their depraved doctrines in every country in Europe. What then would his Holiness think, if any of these congregations were to address a letter to all the Englishmen, and all the Protestants in Italy and Spain, entreating and beseeching them to guard the people of these countries “with diligence and with all due discretion, from those persons who are in the habit of thrusting themselves into the fold of Christ, in order thereby to lead the unwary sheep astray?” A simple English or Scotch congregation would be apt to think this a very just description of the Jesuits; but, if the Pope were to hear of their giving such instructions to their friends in Spain and Italy, as he has given to the priests in Ireland, he would be overwhelmed with astonishment at their impudence; he would send a Legate to complain to our government against such interference; and the persons who should dare to obey the mandate, would be swallowed up by the Inquisition.

The cases, indeed, are not exactly parallel. The congregation *de propaganda de fide*, in Rome, is composed of cardinals and

other great ecclesiastics, with the Pope at their head ; whereas, the British congregation, to which I have alluded, is understood to contain nothing but Christians ; and it may be, of rank in the world no higher than farmers and mechanics. No matter ; they have as good a right to interfere with the education of the subjects of the Pope in Italy, as he and his *sacred* congregation have to interfere with the schools established for the instruction of the people in Ireland. This letter from the Sacred Congregation, is a very important document in my controversy with the Papists. Let it be remembered, that it has not only the authority of the Pope as head of the church, but of the *sacred* congregation as his council. It has, therefore, all the infallibility that a thing of the kind can have ; and nothing more infallible can possibly have issued from the Vatican, since the days of the Council of Trent. Well, then, this document proves, that infallibility may be mistaken ; or that infallibility can tell a deliberate lie. I leave it to the humble servants of the Pope, to make their choice between the two, for it is not possible for them to escape both. It is stated, says his Holiness, “ that the directors of these schools are, generally speaking, Methodists, who introduce Bibles *translated into English by the Bible Society*, and abounding in errors,” &c. Now, though the persons called Methodists, have been honoured to do much good, in both Britain and Ireland, and are, therefore, much abhorred by the Papists, it is not true that the directors of the schools established in Ireland are, generally speaking, of that communion, or properly called by that name. They are members of the established church, and dissenters of various denominations, who have no title to the name of Methodists, farther than as it is used to denote one who loves the souls of his fellow-creatures. But the great blunder which chiefly demands our attention here, is that of representing the Bibles which are distributed, as having been translated into English by the Bible Society. Now, though a miracle should have been wrought for the purpose, his Infallibility ought to have known, that the Bible Society never professed to give, and never did give a single English Bible *of their own translating*, to any man whatever. Their Reports have been annually submitted to the world ; and the Pope might have known, even without a miracle, that the Bibles which they distributed in Ireland, as well as in England, were of the authorized version, which was translated into English more than two hundred years ago. If he had read a copy of the Bible which they distribute, with its dedication to King James I., he would have known this ; but as it is evident that he has not read, or even seen one of them, it required not only Popish impudence, but the impudence of a Pope, to assert that it is “abounding in errors.”

The infallible head of “Catholic Unity” is evidently ignorant of the fact, or he misrepresents it. But his spiritual children in

this country know the fact ; and they know also that their holy father misrepresents it, or mistakes it. Take it either way, I ask them what confidence they can place in such an ecclesiastical head ? If he is capable of making such a mistake with regard to a matter that is published to all the world, how can they trust him with regard to his knowledge of matters which were never published to any man in the world ? If he does not know who translated the English Bible which is read in the Irish schools, which is a matter of public notoriety, how can he know whose souls are still in purgatory ? How can he know how much of the works of supererogation of saints deceased will serve to relieve the saints in purgatory from ages of suffering ? But above all, how can he know how many of the saints departed are beatified in heaven, and therefore entitled to the worship of the faithful on earth ? If our Glasgow Papists can answer these questions, I request them to do it. If they do not, I shall take it for granted that they cannot ; and if, after all, they will still adhere to the Pope, I shall consider them proper children of such a father ;—"Speaking lies in hypocrisy, having their consciences seared as with a hot iron."

But the Pope it seems has become friendly to education. He recommends to his Irish bishops "the establishment of schools, wherein salutary instruction may be imparted to the paupers and illiterate country persons ;" and he hopes the orthodox youth will be kept back from being corrupted, "by the establishment of Catholic schools throughout your diocese." Why did not the Pope find out this before ? Why did he and his predecessors suffer the orthodox youth in Ireland to grow up, and live, and die, with as little education as the cattle ? It was not because he or they thought education at all necessary for the preservation of orthodoxy ; for if they had, they would doubtless have thought of it before the nineteenth century. It is because the Pope finds now, that the people will be educated by the benevolence of their Protestant fellow subjects, whether he will or not ; that they will be able to read the Bible, and that they will get Bibles to read ; and he has taken the alarm lest this should affect the orthodoxy of his children. He calls upon his vassals to exert themselves to the utmost to prevent the evil, by establishing schools of their own, in which, of course, the Bible will not be suffered to appear, and they will teach the children just what they please. This is not because Popery is changed ; or because Papists have become more friendly to education. It is because, in the present state of things, it is necessary to assume the appearance of readiness to educate their youth, in order that they may withdraw them from the schools in which the word of God is read.

The people in Ireland, both young and old, have manifested great eagerness to enjoy the benefit of the schools lately established ; and they know it is not in the power of the priests to

confer such a benefit, because they have not teachers so well qualified ; and they know, that though it were otherwise, the priests in general would not give them the Bible, which thousands have received, and which they are perusing with deep interest, of which there are many striking instances in the Reports of the Hibernian Society, with an extract from one of which I shall conclude the present Number ; intending to take up the Archbishop's charge in my next.

“ The Priest of the Parish having called at the School-house, when G—— was sitting with the Master, began to upbraid O'B—— for daring to continue teaching, after he had so frequently commanded him to give it up. O'B—— made the best defence in his power, and G—— kept silence until the Priest had finished his attack, and O'B—— his defence ; then, in a firm tone, he addressed the Priest in Irish, to this purport :— “ You say that the Society that supports these Free Schools, for the children of the poor, has an evil design ; and allege, in proof of your assertion, that if they had not, they would have put the whole business into the hands of the Parish Priests, and have employed them to engage and pay the Masters ; but do you not know, does not all the world know what would be the issue, were they to act so foolishly ? Give their money, for the education of the poor, into the hands of the Priests ! Yes, you are careful indeed for the poor ! Do not you know, did not all your predecessors in this parish know, the miserable state of the poor, and the impossibility of having their children educated otherwise than by Free Schools ? And have you, or any of them, ever cared a straw about their misery, or once bestowed a thought on the education of their children ? Look at that village on the hill ! You know that it abounds with orphans, and cannot be ignorant of the wretched state of the parents that survive ! Did you ever help them, or care for their orphans ? No ; and now that God has raised them up friends, freely to educate their children, and give them the best of books, you seek to deprive them of the blessing ; to shut them up, as we all have been heretofore, in ignorance and misery ! You say that the Society has an evil design. You want to banish the word of God from the country, that blessed book, which we should all have remained ignorant of, had it not been for the Society and their Schools ; but, be assured, that it is all in vain. The good seed has been sown, and taken root, and your united efforts will never be able to pluck it up.” The Priest heard this lecture with mingled indignation and surprise ; and, turning away, only said, “ You are an unfortunate old man.”

THE  
**Protestant,**

No. LXXXIV.

---

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 19th, 1820.

---

“PROSELYTISM,” says Dr. Kelly, “is the order of the day, and the enemies of our faith, like the serpent, creep and give death under *flowers*.” This will, no doubt, be esteemed a pretty figure of speech; but if I may be allowed to hazard a pun on so grave a subject, I would *insinuate* that his reverence meant *leaves* rather than flowers; and it must be confessed, there do lurk under the leaves of the Bible a host of enemies of the faith of Rome.

I do not deny, but explicitly maintain, that what is life to the souls of the Irish people, is death to the cause of Popery among them; and therefore I am not surprised by the strong language of the titular Archbishop. I am, however, a little surprised by the want of discretion which his language exhibits. He is, like all his brethren, no doubt, desirous of what they call emancipation. This is a boon which the more moderate Papists profess to ask from their Protestant brethren; and it must appear to every thinking person a little strange, that those who are asking the favour, should at the same time be busy publishing letters, in which these said brethren are compared to *wolves* and *serpents*. But such is the fact; and the leading men among the Irish Papists do not hesitate to speak and publish much worse than this against their Protestant neighbours, and their Protestant government, at the very time that they are preparing their *humble* petitions for what they call emancipation. Now, I think there is a want of wisdom, or rather a want of cunning, in this, which shews that Dr. Kelly and his friends have not been long enough under the tuition of the Jesuits. Our Glasgow Papists understand the subject better; for they speak of Protestants as their Christian brethren, which, however hypocritical, is language more becoming

men who are asking the favour of being put upon a footing of civil equality with them. But the language of Dr. Kelly, and that of the Pope whose mandate he obeys, suggests the idea of persons asking a favour, and in the same breath reviling, by every opprobrious epithet, the men of whom they ask it:—"Ye heretics, ye schismatics, ye wolves in sheep's clothing, ye serpents, creeping and giving death under flowers, we humbly pray that you will remove all the restraints which you have imposed upon us, and admit us to a free and unfettered participation of all the good things which ye enjoy!" Surely this would be reckoned an odd way of asking a favour; but it is in the true style of the Irish petitions for emancipation, when taken in connexion with the representations which the petitioners are ever making of their Protestant neighbours, and even their Protestant rulers.

To shew that I am not speaking without book, I refer the reader to another pamphlet by the reverend Mr. Thorpe, of Dublin, entitled, "An Address to the Protestants of Great Britain and Ireland, on the subject of Catholic emancipation.—Third edition, 1815." This author gives a number of extracts from the published speeches and other documents of the Popish orators in Dublin, full of the most scurrilous abuse of all persons connected with the government or legislature, from the king downwards, who have shewn the least hesitation about granting the Papists all that they are demanding. Thus the long continued affliction of our late venerable sovereign, and the violent death of his prime minister, Mr. Perceval, are both represented as judgments of God upon them for being enemies of "Catholic emancipation." This is indeed the substance of a speech made by a gentleman who passes for a Protestant, but who attends public meetings of the Papists; makes speeches for them, and is best known as their advocate. But the following is from a speech of a real Papist—a barrister, and a leading member of the "Catholic board:"—

"The principle of Mr. Pitt's administration," says Mr. O'Connell, "was despotism: the principle of Mr. Perceval's administration was peculating bigotry—bigotted peculation! In the name of the Lord, he plundered the people. Pious and enlightened statesman! he would take their money only for the good of their souls! The principle of the present administration is still more obvious. It has unequivocally disclosed itself in all their movements. It is simple and single—it consists in *falsehood*! *Falsehood* is the bond and link which connects this ministry in office. Some of them pretend to be our friends: *you know it is not true*. They are only our worse enemies for their hypocrisy." page 7.

It is not consistent with my plan to discuss the character of

the present or any former ministry; but I have made the above extract to shew the inconsistency of the Popish leaders, or rather the absurdity of their conduct in professing to come from year to year to parliament, with a humble petition for emancipation, while they are doing every thing in their power to irritate the leading members of parliament against them; for let it be observed, they are not ministers of the crown alone who are objects of their abuse, nor opposers of emancipation alone who suffer their reviling. These demagogues speak of both friends and foes with equal contempt. Thus one member who stands high in the esteem of every virtuous man in the empire, and who is an advocate of "Catholic emancipation," is described by them as "the place-procuring, pray-mumbling Wilberforce." This, with a number of like things, adduced by Mr. Thorpe, excites a suspicion, or rather establishes the fact, that it is not emancipation which our Irish Papists want, but the power of the state in their own hands; and they think it a most likely means to accomplish their object, to represent every man in the government or in the legislature in a most odious light, except a few who are willing to go all lengths with them; and if they, and the Pope, and Dr. Kelly, can but convince the people that all the Protestants, from the highest to the lowest, are "wolves" and "serpents," ready to bite and devour them, they will not be far from having accomplished their purpose.

Our Protestant advocates of "Catholic emancipation," speak with great simplicity and good nature, of both sects living together as one family, if all distinctions were done away, and if both were alike eligible to all places of power and trust. I once entertained some such romantic notions, and therefore I cannot be surprised that some persons still entertain them. But Papists themselves have taught me better. The Pope of Rome calls us wolves, and the Popish Archbishop of Tuam compares us to serpents, for no other reason than that we are teaching the poor to read the Bible. Now, supposing the Archbishop and such as he to have power in their hands, they would find it their bounden duty, and it would be their first care, to extirpate the serpents and the wolves. It is not possible that these can live peaceably as one family with the sheep, that is, the faithful, as Papists call themselves; and therefore the shepherds must of necessity destroy them.

"*Every possible exertion*," says his Holiness, "must be made to keep the youth away from these *destructive schools*." But if the youth could not be kept away by any exertion while the schools exist, as in some places they cannot, would not the extirpation of the teachers come within the sphere of *possible exertions*, if Papists had the power, and if nothing else would do?

"Unless," says Dr. Kelly, "we establish and support schools for the education of distressed children of our persuasion, the triumph will be eventually complete; the mystery of iniquity will have absorbed the mystery of holiness; and what the cruelty of tyrants would not have completed in this island of saints, will be speedily accomplished by softer means." The "mystery of iniquity," is nothing less than the art of reading the word of God. It is not so easy to express in half a sentence what Dr. Kelly means by the "mystery of holiness;" but no doubt it is something which proceeds from him who by way of eminence is called **HIS HOLINESS**; and from what history records of the "man and his communications," and of those of his predecessors for a thousand years, we may guess what sort of thing the holiness is by which his children are distinguished in the "island of saints;" that is, the island of holy persons. The holiness of the children did indeed correspond with that of the father. Of this Dr. Kelly bears the most ample and unequivocal testimony. He declares, in words which I gave in my last Number but one, that they were abandoned to all manner of wickedness, particularly drunkenness, sabbath-breaking, and perjury. This witness is true, as every traveller in Ireland knows; but the mystery of iniquity, that is, the reading of the Bible, has got in among them, and the mystery of holiness is in danger of being absorbed, because the people are not now so much given to the things for which they were formerly notorious. Dr. Kelly will say that I pervert his meaning; but I say that he perverts the meaning of words, when he applies the term *iniquity* to the teaching of the Bible, and *holiness* to the system that opposes it; and it is not the least of the abominations of Popery that it calls good evil, and evil good.

There is such a thing mentioned in the Bible as "the mystery of iniquity;" that is, the secret working of Satan, by the means of human agents, with all deceivableness of unrighteousness, in order to ruin the souls of men. (See 2 Thess. ii. 3—10.) No Protestant needs to be told that this mystery of iniquity has its seat in the Church of Rome. But I do not recollect finding in the Bible, or any where else, except in Dr. Kelly's letter, such a phrase as "the mystery of holiness." If he had said the mystery of *His Holiness*, or even of his Reverence, I might guess what he means; but I can attach no rational meaning to his expression as it stands. The word mystery signifies either something unknown, and which being made known, is a mystery no longer, that is simply a secret; or it signifies something, which, though made known as to its existence, is incomprehensible as to its nature. Take it either way, I do not see what it has to do with holiness, which is neither a secret nor an incomprehensible thing. Christ says, (John iii. 20, 21.) "Every one that doeth evil



hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds should be reproved." This is "the mystery of iniquity." "But he that doeth truth cometh to the light; that his deeds may be made manifest that they are wrought in God." This is holiness, but there is no mystery in it. That which is *manifest* is not mysterious in the sense of a secret; and that which every one can understand (good works for instance) is not incomprehensible.

Be "the mystery of holiness" what it may, we have an explicit admission by the Archbishop, that the cause of Popery in Ireland is in danger from the schools and the Bible:—"What the cruelty of tyrants would not have completed in this island of saints, will be speedily effected by softer means." I hope all the societies and all the teachers engaged in the good work will take courage from this plain declaration of an enemy. The soft means of education and persuasion are the only means which can lawfully be used for promoting the knowledge of the true religion, and turning men from error. Dr. Kelly admits that these means are likely to be effectual, and that "speedily," for absorbing, that is, I suppose, subverting, what he calls the "mystery of holiness," but which we know to be the mystery of iniquity.

It is, however, a little surprising that Father Kelly should not recommend to his clergy the *soft* means which he believes to be so effectual in the hands of Protestants. It is surprising that he should make use of such *hard* words, and recommend, or rather command, such vigorous measures, as are enjoined in the following extract, which he knows to be very different from the means which Protestants use. Why does he not recommend mere persuasion and instruction, since he finds these "softer means" likely to accomplish speedily "what the cruelty of tyrants" could never effect? "As pastors of the Roman Catholic Church," says he, "you must have viewed with *indignation* and *disgust* certain *puerile* and *ignoble* efforts that have lately been made to diminish *our influence*, and mar *our interference* in the religious and moral education and instruction of the youth of our communion; and though we deprecate, as sincerely as any other body of men, any attempt to excite dissension, or to make odious distinctions on account of religion, and have contributed most effectually to preserve the peace of the country, yet it is a duty incumbent on us, and from which we will *never shrink, to oppose, collectively and individually, every attempt*, however *insidious*, or from whatever source it may emanate, to tamper with the religious principles of the faithful committed to our care." Again, "Impressed with the sacredness and importance of this obligation, it is incumbent on us, to be vigilant and attentive to the religious and moral education of the people; the attention of the Roman Catholic clergy is to be particularly directed to the schools es-

tablished in their respective parishes, and they are *to exercise their spiritual authority in its full extent*, in order to prevent Roman Catholic children from frequenting the schools where the Catholic Catechism is not taught, where Protestant Tracts are introduced, or where the moral conduct or religious principles of the master are exceptionable."

Here is the cruelty of tyrants with a witness! And does Dr. Kelly expect, by such rigorous measures as he enjoins upon his clergy, to counteract what Protestants are likely to effect speedily by their softer means? If so, the cruelty of Popish tyrants must be more powerful than that of Protestant ones, as no doubt it is. The spiritual authority of the priests is directed to be exercised in its *full extent* to prevent the children of Papists from frequenting the Protestant schools. Now we know that this spiritual authority is infinitely greater than that of the most absolute monarch on the face of the earth; and in the full extent of it, it reaches to what Dr. Kelly calls (from the Douay version of the New Testament) the day of eternity. We never heard of our Protestant governors inflicting corporal punishment upon those who refused to read the Bible, or who refused to learn to read; but though they had ordered every such obstinate Papist to be hanged, the tyranny of the thing would have fallen infinitely short of that of the priest who exercises the full extent of his spiritual authority to prevent children from going to school, to learn to read the Bible. It is universally admitted that civil governors can only kill the body; but the Popish priests profess to have the power of casting both body and soul into hell.

Now it is a fact that schools have been established in many parts of Ireland, and particularly in that district over which Father Kelly professes to have spiritual jurisdiction. It is a fact that children have flocked to those schools with great eagerness, and that parents have encouraged their children to do so, from a conviction that education is the most likely means of promoting their happiness; and Dr. Kelly calls upon his priests to prevent this by exercising their spiritual authority to its full extent; that is, by excommunicating, and, of course, consigning to everlasting perdition, not the children only, but also the parents who suffer their children to attend the schools in which the Popish catechism is not taught, and whose teachers they do not approve. Besides, it is well known, that great as the extent of priestly spiritual authority is, by which souls are consigned to perdition, this is not all; for they exercise also a temporal authority by which one who is excommunicated is deprived of every earthly comfort; his brethren are forbidden to have any intercourse with him; he becomes an outlaw and a vagabond on the earth; and would be left to perish, surrounded by his fellow creatures, if there were not some

of them, who, in spite of the threatenings of their hard-hearted priests still retain so much of humanity about them as to bestow a morsel of bread to save a fellow creature alive, even at the risk of being excommunicated for the offence, and being reduced to the state of misery which they were guilty of relieving.

In short, the spiritual authority of the Popish priests, exercised in its full extent, subjects those who fall under their displeasure to all the miseries of this life, and to the pains of hell for ever. This is what Dr. Kelly commands his priests to inflict upon all who shall attend, or suffer their children to attend, the schools in which the reading of the Bible is taught. The tyranny and the cruelty are so monstrous that the reader will scarcely believe what he reads; but let any one consider the power which the priests claim over the world to come, the misery which, even in this world, their excommunication inflicts, and the authoritative command of the Archbishop, requiring his clergy to exercise this power to its full extent, and he will be convinced that there is nothing of exaggeration in what I have written.

I have been speaking of the power which the priests profess to have over the world to come, and which their blind followers believe them to have. We know that they have no such power; and we know that they cannot hurt the soul of any man who reads his Bible, and who dies in the belief of what it reveals; but since they profess to have the power, and since they make the people believe them, their cruelty and tyranny is as great as if they actually possessed it, and as if they actually exercised it, by casting into hell every Bible reader, and every parent who suffers his child to go to school that he may learn to read it; and to their fiend-like cruelty they add the wickedness of imposing upon the people, by professing to have powers which they never had, and which the Almighty never intrusted to any creature.

Dr. Kelly makes a parade of what he and his brethren have done in preserving the peace of the country, though it might be *insinuated* that the less they said on that subject the better. It is very well known, that the more ostensible men among them make great professions of loyalty, while their subalterns are doing every thing in their power to promote a spirit of disaffection. Besides, the language of both Dr. Kelly and his master the Pope, is not such as we would expect from men who are desirous of preserving the peace of the country. Do Papists expect to maintain peace by calling their Protestant neighbours, who are labouring to instruct them, wolves and serpents, and by accusing the government of tyranny, and of a design to extirpate their religion by violence and persecution, which has been abandoned only in *some degree*? If Ireland is happy enough to enjoy peace with such men in it, it is not in consequence of their exertions, but in spite of them.

Dr. Kelly claims for himself and his inferior priests, a power and influence over the people that is inconsistent with their privileges as subjects of the British empire ; and he complains of efforts lately made " to diminish our influence, and mar our interference in the religious and moral education of the youth of our communion." Now I ask what right they have to such influence ? Let them shew from whom they received the grant of an exclusive right to interfere with the education of either young or old. It is certain that they have received no such grant from any authority that is lawfully acknowledged in this country. If they say they have it from the Pope, then I reply that the Pope has given them what was not his own, and what he had no right to give away. I do not refuse them all the influence which their priests may lawfully derive from their talents and personal character, nor the exercise of it by persuasion and fair argument. In short, I would not deny them that influence and right of interference which Protestants have a right to exercise, and which they are exercising for the benefit of the people. But that which Papists claim is avowedly exclusive and arbitrary :—" We will oppose," says Dr. Kelly, " collectively and individually, every attempt, however insidious, or from whatever source it may emanate, to tamper with the religious principles of the faithful committed to our care." This tampering, as I have already shewn, signifies teaching the word of God ; and if Parliament were to pass an Act for establishing schools in every parish in Ireland in which the Bible was to be read, the priests tell us before-hand that they would oppose the measure both collectively and individually. So much for their subjection to the powers that be.

I remark in conclusion, that though this Manifesto against the Bible and the schools in which it is taught, is evidently a commencement of actual hostility on the part of the Papists, against the benevolent efforts of their Protestant neighbours, it has notwithstanding given me great satisfaction. It convinces me that the labours of the teachers have begun to produce the desired effect ; that the reading of the Bible has begun to tell upon the sentiments and conduct of the poor people who had formerly been kept in ignorance and bondage by their priests. In short, to use the language of the worthy Bradbury, on another occasion,— " The schools, by means of the Bible, have begun to crush the head of the old serpent in Ireland, and it is not surprising that we should hear the hissing of the generation of vipers."

THE

# Protestant,

No. LXXXV.

---

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 26th, 1820.

---

I HAVE done, for the present, with the Pope, and the Popish Archbishop of Tuam; but before I proceed to another general subject of discussion, I shall pay my respects to a more obscure son of the church, who has done me the favour of addressing me a letter, which exhibits as fine a specimen of Popish logic as any man would wish to see. This letter has the Newton-Stewart post mark; and it is the only one that I have received direct from the holy church, since I published that of W. D.

“ TO THE AUTHOR OF THE PROTESTANT.

“ SIR,

“ I have been favoured with a loan of two or three of your Numbers. In perusing No. 72, it occurred to me as rather strange, that while, with quick sighted penetrating eye, you could discern, from the circumstance of the poor woman being obliged to pay eight shillings to the Catholic priest for the baptism of her child, &c. that “ the good citizens of Glasgow, who,” (with so much credit to their pious sentiments) “ lately made so bold a stand against being taxed for the purpose of building parish churches, are actually, though indirectly, taxed for the building and support of a Popish chapel,” the same sagacity did not discover to you, that the “ good citizens of Glasgow,” are also actually, though indirectly, taxed for the purpose of purchasing radical flags, Carlile’s publication, &c. to those who, notwithstanding, from their own reports, and those of their abettors, are labouring under such distresses, as not to be able to support themselves except by public munificence.

“ What are we to infer from this inequality of vision? Are we to conclude that while the author of the Protestant hates Popery, he loves radical reform and infidelity? This is not so very like real Christianity. When you have answered these questions, I will point out some more for your solution. I am, SIR,

A FRIEND TO FAIR DEALING

"N. B. It seems rather curious, that our good citizens, who are so zealous for their liberties that they will not permit government to find any of them guilty on a charge of constructive treason, can yet, notwithstanding, find the Catholics guilty of such remote and far-sought consequences of their conduct, as the taxing of the citizens of Glasgow, for the purpose of erecting places of worship by means of the priest exacting a fine from the poor widow, according to the rules of the church."

So then, it seems, it is a rule of the Church of Rome to fine poor widows who happen to be left with young children. If so, I must acquit Mr. Scott of cruelty and extortion. He does not exact money from poor widowed mothers because he loves the money, but because it is a rule of the church to do so, and he is solemnly sworn to obey all her canons and rules. But what sort of a church must that be that has such a rule? It is a character of pure and undefiled religion, to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction; and to do good to the fatherless and the widow. This evidently implies that we give them something, if they are poor: but no, say the Popish priests, we visit them that we may fine them, "according to the rules of the church."

It is not in my power to satisfy the curiosity which my correspondent expresses in his *nota bene*, for it never was a matter of consideration with me, or my Protestant friends, what we would, and what we would *not*, *permit* government to do. This language is peculiarly Popish; and if the priests had the power which they claim, it would soon be found that government could do nothing without their permission. As to the case in hand, the consequence is not far sought. If a poor widow receives five shillings from the Town's Hospital to buy meal for herself and children; and if instead of buying the meal and feeding her family, she gives the money, or a part of it, to the priest to pay his chapel debts, the citizens are actually paying a tax to the chapel; and both the widow and the priest are guilty of imposition. She must again apply to her neighbours to keep her family from starving; or if she can keep them by her own exertions, it is imposition to ask supply from the hospital.

I shall very soon despatch the queries which this "friend to fair dealing" puts to me; and I shall be happy to receive those which he promises, as soon as he pleases, for it is my great desire that my opponents would write. Well then, I wish my correspondent to understand that I was writing about Papists, and not about radical Reformers; and that it would have been as much out of my way to point out the imposition of which he accuses the latter, supposing I had known them to be guilty of it, as it would have been to censure the man in the moon for gathering sticks on the Sabbath-day, according to the vulgar opinion. I have, on purpose, brought this simile from a distance, that it might resemble

the style of my correspondent. Perhaps he will infer that I am an advocate of Sabbath-breaking, because I have not found fault with the man in the moon for his conduct; and the inference will be as fair as that which convicts me of radicalism and infidelity, because I have not attacked the Radicals, and the readers of Carile's pamphlets. Besides, there never was certified to me a single instance of a person who was receiving the bounty of his neighbours, for the support of himself and family, applying that bounty in the way which my correspondent describes. He may, however, know of such instances, and if he does, he can prove that the Radicals are like the Papists, which is a point that I shall not dispute with him. I will even admit that the alliance between the two, is closer than some people are aware of; I could say a good deal on this subject, but I shall defer it, at least till I know the nature of the other questions which he promises to put to me.

It will perhaps appear to some readers that I have attached more importance to the foregoing letter than it deserves. It is certainly very unimportant considered in itself; but it is of use as a specimen of the Popish mode of conducting controversy. Papists will never meet an argument or a fact in a fair and candid manner; but always endeavour to draw away their readers to something else. My statement was a very plain and simple one. A fair opponent would have controverted the facts, if he had thought them doubtful; or, finding them incontrovertible, he would have admitted them, and then have endeavoured to palliate the conduct of the priest, by pleading that the rules of his church imposed upon him the hardship of doing things that were repugnant to his own feelings; or, if this would not do, he might have admitted that in this instance, the priest's conduct was cruel and unjust, and that he left him to answer for himself. But no such candour will ever be found in a Papist. The church he considers infallible; he believes her priests can never do wrong; and when they are detected in doing things that look very like crimes, and which would be called crimes, if committed by any other person, he instantly raises a hue and cry about something else, in order to cover the guilt which he cannot deny, and which he has not the grace to acknowledge. Thus the "friend to fair dealing" would cover the extortion of the ghostly father in Glasgow, by setting **THE PROTESTANT** and his readers a hunting after the crimes of the Radicals.

It is worth while to remark here, that not one of the instances of priestly extortion which I have given has been controverted. The story of M'Murray, though proved to be true in every material point, had yet so much obscurity about it, as to encourage our Papists, and their hired advocate, to strain every nerve to convict me of a fabrication. All the agents which they could employ in the three kingdoms were set to work for this purpose. They

failed, indeed, in proving their point; but the very zeal and activity which they shewed in this case, shews, that had the truth of any of my other statements been doubtful, they would have taken care to expose them. Their absolute silence, therefore, on these points, is a tacit admission that all my statements are true; and, to adopt their own mode of expression for once, I hereby inform them, that when they have replied to these, I will furnish them with more.

The following letter is from a gentleman in the north of Ireland. It has been lying past me for two months, because I had not an opening for it sooner. The writer is an entire stranger to me; but I am sure the letter will commend itself to the reader, by the plain good sense of it. Modesty would perhaps require me to suppress the complimentary passages; but I choose rather to give it verbatim as I received it.

“FOR THE PROTESTANT.

December 10th, 1819.

“SIR,

“Your exertions deserve the approbation of all who know and prize the truth. You have done, and well too, what every man, enlightened by the truth, knows he should have done, and yet must reproach himself for not having done; you have contended “for the faith once delivered to the saints.” In the name of this country, I thank you for the affectionate interest you have shewn, in sending your publication to Dublin. Let me urge you to extend your charitable exertions; yet when I name the place on behalf of which I ask your exertions, you may object to my word “*extend*,” I do not call on you to go beyond Dublin, as you might suppose, both from the word, and from the notorious and depraved ignorance of the southern, that is, the eminently Popish parts of Ireland. I request your attention for a part of Ireland, much nearer to you; in fact, your next neighbour; and a part, of which, I apprehend, you on your side of the water have formed very erroneous notions. B——t is the place to which I would anxiously direct your attention, and which in my opinion requires information on the nature of Popery as much as any part of Ireland. In the Popish parts your publication cannot produce much effect; because those who might profit by it, are most diligently excluded from this opportunity by the never failing vigilance of the priests; but here every one thinks himself able to read, and qualified to judge; and of the soundness of that opinion I shall leave you to judge, when I tell you, that *liberalit*., as the *cant* of the day is, flourishes abundantly; and all professions of religion are alike in the opinion of the *Liberals*. God forbid, all Christian men should not abound in holy meekness and forbearance:



they should be distinguished from the world by these virtues displaying themselves in the minutest part of their conduct. Their very thoughts should betray themselves in attractive scintillations of these duties. But to compromise the truth of scripture, and join in with the worthless cant of an ungodly world, and call indifference to the truth by the honourable and specious name of *liberality*; this a Christian dares not do, *μη γενωτο*. Many persons, however, misled by this specious word, and perhaps possessed of holier views, heedlessly adopt the cry of the day, and unawares are deserting the standard of the gospel. These are persons who would read your publication, and to whom it might be useful. There is another class also, to whom I should wish your work known. They are persons of much worth and amiableness of disposition, who, in their political views, see in Papists nothing but suffering individuals, and are blinded by their own compassion and generosity, so that they see not what the true nature of Popery is. They think Popery is like any other profession of Christianity, not being aware that the most monstrous claims put forward, the most absurd doctrines taught, the most tyrannical attempts made by the villany of man on the rights and privileges of rational beings, have been by Popes; and that the immutability of the church, *the boast, and peculiar ground of exultation among the Papists*, on which they lay the greatest stress as proving their superiority, and from which they declare they cannot recede *without impiety*, renders it the extreme of folly to expect any mitigation. Here then there can be no compromise, and I wish for your publication here, because it sets this so strongly forward.

“I have gone on farther than I designed at first, but I should leave my subject grievously imperfect, if I did not present to your notice another description of persons, whom perhaps you would little expect to hear of among us.

“We boast, you know, of being here a kind of reformed specimen of the Scottish church. We have the same confession, the Assembly’s larger and smaller catechisms, our elders, and presbyteries, and synods. In short, we preserve among us, the forms and formularies of those worthy men who hazarded their lives for the cause, who would have gone to death rather than not testify their abhorrence of the harlot church, drunk with the blood of the saints, who would have shuddered at the bare thought of holding any terms with the unscriptural doctrines of the Romish church. Would you not then, Sir, be surprised at hearing a Protestant dissenting teacher in this country, declaring in a public meeting, in a speech got up for the occasion, that the differences between us and the Church of Rome, were but on *minor points!!!* I heard this declaration myself, else I might have been tempted to suppose, that any person reporting it to me, might have been mistaken. Let

us set aside forms of discipline and church government, and must we not feel, that the man who could say, that the vital doctrines of the gospel, and the corruptions of these blessed doctrines, by the Romish church, are in themselves not materially different, is far gone from the spirit that once animated his church; and does not such a man need instruction?

“In the midst of much worldly wisdom and commercial information here, an opinion has gained ground, founded on a very illogical deduction, that wisdom in other things is a necessary accompaniment. Now, Sir, you can appreciate this mistake, but it has produced its effect. People without any pretensions to information on religious subjects, take upon them to pronounce *en maître*; and as they speak from the light of nature only, they necessarily declare against revelation, without being aware of it. In this state of mind they are soon and easily landed in infidelity, or if they are still for a religious profession, they are in most exquisite training to receive the doctrines of Popery, which, you know, are no more, than the doctrines of the natural mind drest up in the garb of the gospel; the sentiments of the unrenewed man, set out in the gospel phrase. To aid on the career of these things, we have an active man, a member of the Romish church, among us, and some who call themselves Protestant dissenting ministers, who go hand in hand with him, to the betraying of the cause they should support. Do you not think such an emergency requires your interference? I would fain hope you do, and that you will make a trial of sending over some numbers of your publication hither. You may reckon on my exertions in its favour, as well as those of all to whom the truth is dear.

“Believe me your’s truly, &c.

“A PROTESTANT.”

In reply to the first part of the foregoing, I have merely to say, that I have no merit, and am entitled to no thanks, for sending my work to Dublin. Some gentlemen in that city, of their own accord, solicited, and were instantly granted, permission to reprint it, promising to bear the loss, if there was any; and to give the profits, if there were any, to charitable purposes. I request, therefore, that the friends of the Protestant religion in Ireland, will countenance and circulate the Dublin edition. In doing so, they will serve the double purpose of promoting a knowledge of the Protestant religion, as opposed to Popery, and of affording pecuniary aid to the societies established for the education of the poor. I have already distributed out of the profits of the Glasgow edition, about a hundred and fifty pounds, chiefly for the purpose of education; and though I am quite ignorant of the extent of the Dublin circulation, I hope something will accrue from it also, to aid the societies, whose object it is to teach the poor in Ireland to read the Bible.

There is not in the whole world, a greater enemy to real Christianity than that sentimentalism of which my correspondent complains. He calls it liberality, in condescension to the phraseology of the day; but it is a liberality which consists in thinking favourably of every thing human, and lightly of every thing divine.

It is indeed surprising to hear of a Protestant dissenting teacher, speaking of the difference between Protestants and Papists, as a difference only on *minor points*. But it is one of the evils of the day, that persons take upon them both to speak and write upon subjects which they have not studied, and of which they know nothing. My correspondent is surprised that among descendants of the suffering Presbyterians of Scotland, Popery should be regarded with such a favourable, at least, with such an unsuspicious eye; but what would he think if he knew that among the Presbyterians themselves of the present day, at least by many of them, who occupy the very ground which was soaked with the blood of their fathers, Popery is looked upon as a very harmless thing? Such, however, I believe, is the fact; and I think it cannot be accounted for on any other principle, than that many of our countrymen, and even of our clergy, have lost sight of the foundation on which the Protestant religion rests, and of what their fathers suffered in maintaining it.

Another correspondent in the sister kingdom, who approves of the plan which I have taken to bring Popery into utter scorn and contempt, writes as follows. His letter does not seem to have been written with a view to publication; and therefore I shall give the extract, without the names of persons, which he has given me, without reserve. "There is," says my correspondent, "a *gentleman usher-like-way* of handling this coarse subject, which produces no manner of effect, and this is very common in Ireland: for instance, ——— lately preached a sermon, which was praised up to the skies, and ordered to be printed, in which he says, that for *our own household, God forbid that we should not teach them catechisms, &c. propounding the true Christian faith; but for others, I would have schoolmasters mild, kind, &c. but not given to proselytism.*"

I know no divine law that requires a man to seek the salvation of his own household, that does not require him also to seek that of his nearest neighbour, and of the child that may be placed under his care, if he has the honour of being a teacher; but the preacher above referred to would object to this, because it would savour of proselytism; and it is impossible that a Protestant teacher can do his duty without falling under the accusation. My correspondent proceeds as follows:

"Now giving a Bible, with an unmutilated Decalogue, is pro-

selytism. Using a Testament in which the word *μετανοια*, that change of heart which is called genuine repentance, is not erroneously translated, "Do penance," would be proselytism. Teaching the children on any of the 143 Popish holy days, would be proselytism. But *this proselytism*, which we ought to attempt in season, and out of season, for the recovery of perishing sinners, is in the genteeler circles of milk-and-water Christians, utterly condemned and disclaimed. Mr.—— (a leading M. P. on the side of Catholic emancipation) once wrote to the Primate, that in the new schools (afterwards founded on this neutral plan) he would have the Christian religion, but *no particular description of it*, taught to the Irish peasantry. That is, he would give them *a whole* containing no *parts*; and taking for granted, which is false, that there is a kind of general Christianity, a broad cloak, under which, all who choose to call themselves Christians may nestle, each, out of complaisance, giving up his particular opinions, and amalgamate into one *liberal mass* of men, preferring present to future peace; and forgetting that there is but *one Lord*, there is but *one baptism*, and *one faith*."

My correspondent proceeds to express his approbation of the manner in which I have treated the subject; that is, the open and honest way of calling things by their own names; and openly avowing it as my object to proselyte men to the truth by all "practicable means;" that is, by all means that can be practised upon Christian principles; and I desire not to have recourse to any other.

In reply to the observations of those who think that I have not treated the Popish Archbishop of Tuam with the respect to which he is entitled from his high office, I remark, that I will yield to no man in respect for persons who hold high offices in virtue of the word of God, and the law of the land; but I do not look upon any Popish priest, however high his rank among Papists, as entitled to such respect. While the Israelites were commanded to respect the priesthood of Aaron, they were absolutely prohibited to respect the priests of idols. If I have succeeded in proving the Church of Rome idolatrous, as I think I have, I cannot consistently respect her priesthood. Kelly of Tuam is no more to me than M<sup>c</sup>Corry in the Saltmarket. Each is labouring in his own sphere to *uphold* the *infallible* church; and though the latter would tremble at sight of the former, as in the presence of a superior being, I consider him as the more honourable personage of the two, for he is more usefully employed in vending old clothes, than the Archbishop in vending the old intolerant nostrums of Rome.

**Protestant,**

No. LXXXVI.

---

 SATURDAY, MARCH 4th, 1820.
 

---

ROME's "mystery of iniquity" appears in nothing more palpable, than in the practice of what she calls Auricular Confession. By means of this she has access to the heart of every sinner in her communion, maintains an absolute authority over his conscience, and directs his conduct as she pleases: and this prerogative does not belong to the "Church" alone, considered in her collective capacity, nor to the Pope alone, as head of the Church: it belongs in common to every pedant of a priest, who considers himself divinely appointed to receive the confessions of sinners. and authorised to absolve them from all their iniquities.

I do not know that I can introduce this subject better than by inserting a communication from a correspondent, purporting to be a "PASTORAL LETTER" from Rome, to the Bishops and Clergy who acknowledge the Pope for their head, and who have sworn obedience to him as such. The author has professedly made the "Franciscan" of Buchanan the ground-work of his composition, and has adapted the sentiments to the state of matters in our own day. The reader is requested to connect what follows with the lines which I inserted in my 81st Number; and he will have the epistle complete. The former quotation related to the withholding the Bible from the people; what follows, relates chiefly to confession.

## A PASTORAL LETTER FROM ROME.

\* \* \* \* \*

AND since this world's the rough wild field we till,  
 Let us disseminate the seeds of ill,  
 Commence our labours ever in good time,  
 Corrupt the hearts of youth before their prime;  
 Keep them from Bibles, stupify their mind,  
 And full returns in manhood we shall find.  
 Teach them to lie, to flatter and deceive,  
 A source of gain shall rise from every knave:  
 For if mankind should too religious grow,  
 "THE CHURCH" must half her perquisites forego.

Sin swells the Bank that feeds the Pontiff's purse,  
 And true Religion proves his greatest curse ;  
 Rome's ancient fabrick on some pillars leans,  
 The props of all her glory and her gains :  
 Of these, CONFESSION holds the highest place,  
 That ready mode of merchandizing grace ;  
 The fairest farm may disappoint the swain  
 Who looks in Autumn for the promised grain ;  
 Tho' grapes should load the branches of the vine,  
 Hail, rain, or wind, may blast our hopes of wine ;  
 War may lay waste the monarch's wide domains,  
 And sweep the crops and cattle from the plains ;  
 But strict Confession, to a knowing hand,  
 Yields fruit more certain than the fairest land ;  
 No rain, no storms, no dire effects of war,  
 Its regular returns of profit mar.  
 Arm'd with this weapon, princes feel our weight,  
 When fit occasion serves in every state ;  
 Kings from their throne indignant have we hurl'd,  
 And beggars raised to rule a conquer'd world ;  
 The Corsican usurper's friends we stood,  
 Crown'd, bless'd, and married him to royal blood, }  
 Leaving his lawful wife in widow-hood ;  
 'Think not our influence we over-rate,  
 Recounting thus our power in the state ;  
 For when the secrets of all men we know,  
 Prolific seeds of treason we may sow,  
 And with sly hints at numbers and their force,  
 Incite the mob to each rebellious course :  
 Kindle fell rancour in the people's breast,  
 Against the men we envy or detest ;  
 Marking them by some execrable name,  
 We blast them as the sons of sin and shame ;  
 Doom'd in their cursed carcasses to feel  
 The fiery faggot or th' avenging steel ;  
 And when we lead our friends into a scrape, }  
 Or they are charged with murder or with rape,  
 We often make a way for their escape,  
 By large collections at our altars made,  
 To hired witnesses and lawyers paid,  
 By closely questioning and shriving those  
 Who must give testimony for our foes,  
 And by that practice which the Christian loaths,  
 Our ABSOLUTIONS, for man's broken oaths.  
 Hear now to whom your chief attention's due,  
 Still keep this wise arrangement in your view.  
 Let the old matron claim your prior care,  
 Whose wealth and weakness seem to promise fair,  
 Whose abject superstition may supply  
 The means your avarice to gratify ;  
 Next let the usurer attract your eye,  
 Who loves to live in sin, a saint to die ;  
 The merchant next, the profits of whose trade  
 Require that off'rings to the church be made,  
 Make the transgressor compromise with gold,  
 The oaths he falsely swore, the lies he told :  
 And should your friends hold offices of state,  
 Should they become by blood, or plunder, great, }  
 Or dare against our views to legislate ;

Mark them as sources of abundant gain,  
 High must the penance be when deep the stain;  
 When stretch'd in agony upon his bed,  
 A mortal fever strikes the rich man's head;  
 When drugs and doctors bring no more relief,  
 And all his family are plung'd in grief;  
 Be sure ye carefully that bed attend,  
 As if this Dives were your dearest friend;  
 Though vice had stain'd his life too gross to name,  
 For which you witness neither grief nor shame;  
 Give him your transubstantiated bread,  
 Your off'ring for the living and the dead;  
 Anoint his body, whisper in his ear,  
 That from each mortal sin you've made him clear,  
 That trusting in himself and in the Pope,  
 He needs no stronger anchor for his hope;  
 And as the awful hour of death draws nigh,  
 Leave him in fatal ignorance to die.  
 For his departed soul let mass be sung,  
 Processions walk, and blessed bells be rung;  
 And offer "*months minds*" till the purging fire  
 By floods of holy water shall expire.  
 But let rich souls alone at rest be laid,  
 Send *them* to heaven when your fees are paid.  
 As for the beastly beggars when they die,  
 Let them for ever in these torments lie;  
 Guide not their lifeless bodies to the grave,  
 Nor waste one Mass their sordid souls to save.  
 No time, no pains, no thought should you bestow,  
 On those from whom no recompense can flow;  
 For where's the wise man that was ever found,  
 To waste his labours on a barren ground,  
 To spend his swiftness in a vain pursuit,  
 Or water gardens that produce no fruit.  
 If there's a man who dares to keep aloof,  
 Who dreads to see us come beneath his roof,  
 Who will not often to CONFESSION come,  
 That mighty main spring of the Church of Rome,  
 Send for his servants, and of them inquire  
 His mode of life, their diet and their hire,  
 Fish for some secret floating in their mind,  
 Which, if you dext'rously by questions, find,  
 And manage well, may bring him to his knees,  
 To beg for secrecy, and proffer fees.  
 But if no chance shall throw it in your way,  
 An accusation to his charge to lay,  
 If his pure life defies the voice of fame  
 A single crime against him to proclaim,  
 Then cry out HERESY—impeach his creed,  
 Call him a WOLF, and then you will succeed.  
 Fear will compel him to pull down his pride,  
 And cast the veil 'twixt him and you, aside.  
 But let no prayers, or tears, or length of time  
 Avail to gain forgiveness of his crime,  
 Until by fees and fasting, render'd pure,  
 His reconciliation he secure.  
 When by close care and artifice refined,  
 You have explored the secrets of the mind;

When the fair sinner once has told you more  
 Than ever human ear had heard before ;  
 When the rich rogue, to consequences blind,  
 Has told you what he did, and he designed ;  
 When the pale murderer has told the tale,  
 Which brings him to the block if you reveal ;  
 Then Proteus-like assume what form you please,  
 For all these victims may be spoil'd at ease.  
 Fear no refusal to your high demands,  
 Their character—their life is in your hands ;  
 Nor lose your spoil by taking for your fee,  
 A worthless gratitude, which false must be.  
 For still, whoever has uncased his mind,  
 To dread his confident must be inclined.  
 Conscious of guilt, he wishes that man dead,  
 Whose frown can heap confusion on his head.  
 When issuing edicts, dip your pens in gall,  
 Keep taunting nick-names ready at a call,  
 And when you wish to strike a Christian dead,  
 Pelt Latin texts of Scripture at his head.  
 In this we have a precedent of note,  
 For Lucifer himself could Moses quote.  
 Guard our old building, on saint Peter's rock,  
 With energy against each hostile shock ;  
 And when rash men with sacrilegious eye,  
 Into this edifice should dare to pry,  
 And point out portions of the crazy wall,  
 Which ne'er were built by Peter or by Paul,  
 Blast them as heretics condemned to dwell  
 To all eternity in flames of hell.  
 Nor with less fury than the flames below,  
 Let Purgatory's profitable furnace glow,  
 With this great difference, that the purging flame,  
 By papal walls, and masses, we may tame.  
 Tell the wild Irishmen, that when they die,  
 Their souls must here in horrid anguish lie,  
 Until surviving friends their pardon buy ;  
 And should some wag in his own vulgar way,  
 To your grave reverences dare to say,  
 I see on each of you so mild a face,  
 And so much feeling in your features trace,  
 I cannot think there can be such a place.  
 For if ye have the power by pray'r or spell,  
 Yet use it not, to quench this new found hell,  
 How can the fear of God within ye dwell ?  
 Reply—that he with heresy is cramm'd,  
 And tell the clown that if he doubts he's damn'd ;  
 And recollect, descanting on the mass,  
 To make our priestly dignity surpass  
 All competition, for no son of man,  
 On earth or sea's immeasurable span,  
 Except ourselves, can of some grains of wheat,  
 A living moving mass of flesh create ;  
 Bow down to, and revere, a work so fine,  
 Then break in pieces, plunge it into wine,  
 Bruise, 'twixt the teeth, the blood, the bones, the skin,  
 And swallow all, a sacrifice for sin.  
 Thus thro' the land, your pious progress take,



At every step, some shining money make ;  
 Rail at your king's religion—curse the fools,  
 Who send their children to Hibernian schools ;  
 Absolve the ribbonman, on whom devolves  
 The mighty task of punishing the "wolves,"  
 Who "in sheep's clothing" have been found so bold,  
 As to affright the Propaganda fold.

Signata Romæ,  
 Sub Sigillo Piscatoris,  
 Prid. Kalend.—1820.

I. D. F. Sec. &c.

This subject is intimately connected with that of penance. I shall therefore give the doctrine concerning both as laid down by the Council of Trent, *Sess. 4. Canon 1. Si quis dixerit, &c.* "Let him be accursed, who shall affirm that penance is not truly, and properly a sacrament, instituted and appointed in the universal church, by our Lord Christ himself, for the reconciling those Christians to the divine Majesty, who have fallen into sin after their baptism." They teach farther (*Sess. 14. Cap. 2.*) "That this sacrament consists of two parts, *viz.* the matter and the form; the matter of the sacrament is the act or acts of the penitent, namely, contrition, confession, and satisfaction; the form of it is the act of the priest in these words, *absolvo te.*" I absolve thee. "That therefore it is the duty of every man, (*cap. 3.*) who hath fallen after baptism, as aforesaid, to confess his sins at least once a year to a priest."—"That this confession is to be secret (*cap. 5*) ; for public confession is neither commanded nor expedient."—"That this confession of mortal sin be very exact, (*cap. 5.*) and particular, together with all circumstances, especially such as *speciem facti mutant*, alter the kind or degree of sin, and that it extend to the most secret sins, even of thought, or against the 9th and 10th commandment." That is the 10th, according to our division, for the church of Rome divides it into two, to make up the number, having left out the second. And lastly, "That the penitent thus doing, (*cap. 6.*) the absolution hereupon pronounced is not conditional or declarative only, but absolute and judicial." That is, the priest, on receiving confession, as above described, pronounces a full and everlasting pardon of all the sins so confessed, a pardon which the sinner may take and plead at the day of judgment, against all charges that may then be brought against him on account of the sins which he has confessed.

Before proceeding to expose the wickedness of the doctrines above taught, I shall give more in detail, what Papists avow, as well as what they disavow, on the subject of confession, from Gother's "Papist Misrepresented and Represented" First, what they disavow, as in the words following:—"The Papist misre-

presented believes it part of his religion to make gods of men; foolishly thinking that these have power to forgive sins. And therefore as often as he finds his conscience oppressed with the guilt of his offences, he calls for one of his priests; and having run over a catalogue of his sins, he asks of him pardon and forgiveness. And what is most absurd of all, he is so stupid as to believe that, if his ghostly father, after he has heard all his villainies in his ear, does but pronounce three or four Latin words over his head, his sins are forgiven him, although he had never any thoughts of amendment, or intention to forsake his wickedness." I hope to shew, before I have done, that there is no misrepresentation in the above, but let us first hear what is avowed on this subject.

"The Papist truly represented believes it damnable in any religion to make gods of men. However, he firmly holds, that when Christ, speaking to his Apostles, said, John xx. 21. 'Receive ye the Holy Ghost; whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven, and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained;' he gave them, and their successors, the Bishops and Priests of the catholic church, authority to absolve any penitent sinner from his sins. And God having thus given them the ministry of reconciliation, and made them Christ's legates, 2 Cor. v. 18, 19, 20. Christ's ministers, and the dispensers of the mystery of Christ, 1 Cor. iv. and given them power that whosoever they loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven, Mat. xxviii. 18. he undoubtedly believes that whosoever comes to him making a sincere and humble confession of his sins, with a true repentance and firm purpose of amendment, and a hearty resolution of turning from his evil ways, may from them receive absolution, by the authority given them from heaven, and no doubt but God ratifies above the sentence pronounced in that tribunal; loosing in heaven whatsoever is thus loosed by them on earth. And that whosoever comes without the due preparation, without a repentance from the bottom of his heart, and real intention of forsaking his sins, receives no benefit by the absolution; but adds sin to sin, by a high contempt of God's mercy, and abuse of his sacraments."

From the above authorities it appears that the church of Rome makes it the indispensable duty of every member of her body to tell all his or her sins to a priest at least once a year. Now if this were literally obeyed, I venture to affirm that every member of the church would require to have a priest to himself, and that the whole year would be occupied by every priest in hearing the confessions of a single individual. There is not an hour of a man's life, in which he does not commit sin in thought, word, or deed. Every imagination of the thoughts of the heart of man is evil, and only evil continually. He who alone knows the human heart

has declared this to be its character. What then must we think of that religion which teaches that a person may, in a few minutes, confess to a priest all the sins which he has committed in the course of a whole year? The thing is as impossible as to recal and relate all the thoughts which have passed through his mind during the same period; it is as impossible as to recal in an hour, and preserve in a bottle, all the air that has passed through his lungs in breathing during twelve months. Yet, according to the doctrine of the church of Rome, it is necessary that every man and woman effect this impossibility.

I know that the Romish casuists make an exception of sins which they call *venial*; and they require only that a man confess the *mortal* sins which he may have committed in the course of the year; but this is a distinction of their own making, and it involves an error the most pernicious and fatal, that ever was invented by the father of lies. Sin in every form, and every degree, is the object of divine abhorrence. The wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all unrighteousness, without exception. Men, thinking only of what affects their own comfort and security in this world, look upon some sins as great, and others as little. Robbery and murder, for instance, are great sins, and swearing and false worship are little ones, because the latter do us little harm, whereas the former are hurtful to society. But this is not the rule by which the Almighty judges. It is the alienation of the heart of man from himself that constitutes the guilt of the sinner in His sight; and this alienation appears to him in the most secret thoughts, and the most trivial actions of the sinner, as really as in those actions which are most condemned by his fellow creatures. If our Popish doctors were to sit down and make out a list of the sins which they call venial, I am verily persuaded they would place that of our first parents in eating the forbidden fruit at the top of the list. I defy them to find, in the whole catalogue of human transgressions, from the creation of the world, one, *considered in itself*, more venial than this. What harm could there be in eating the fruit of one tree more than another? This is the cavil of infidels at this day; and, upon the supposition that any sin is venial, it is impossible to make a satisfactory reply.

But in point of fact, we know that this sin "brought death into the world, and all our woe." By this single offence of one man, judgment came upon all men to condemnation. Sin consists in disobedience to our Creator and Lawgiver; and whether this disobedience appear in things which men call great, or things which they call little, it indicates a state of mind at enmity against God, and which deserves all the punishment, which he has threatened against transgressors.

What an enemy to the souls of men, therefore, must the church of Rome be, which teaches that there are some sins so venial, that is, so trifling, that it is not worth while to confess them; that God will not mark them, at least not mark them, or remember them, so as to exact punishment for them! This, however, is so interwoven with Popery as to constitute an essential part of the system; and if there was nothing else objectionable in it, this alone would exhibit it to the world, as a religion, not of God, but a mystery of iniquity emanating from the Prince of darkness.

The revelation of divine mercy, by the gospel of Christ, proceeds upon the assumption, that all men are utterly lost and undone, on account of sin. Christ came to put away sin, by the sacrifice of himself. He laid down his life as a ransom for many. Now in the whole history of this wonderful transaction, we find not the least hint that any sin was so venial, as not to require expiation. It was to put away sin, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, that the Saviour of the world laid down his life. It was sin, without distinction of great or little, venial or mortal, that rendered this infinite sacrifice necessary, in order that we might be saved. Those who are saved by grace cannot possibly look upon any sin as venial. They will, in secret, confess to God every sin of which they are conscious, encouraged to do so by his own word, "If we confess our sins he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all iniquity."

But Popery carnalizes every thing. It reduces this sublime view of Christian piety, and privilege, to the mere annual form of confessing to a fellow creature, and receiving his absolution: And as such fellow creature cannot hear the thousandth part of the confessing sinner's transgressions, but only a few of his enormous crimes, such as eating flesh on Friday, or in lent, the penitent is taught to believe that his other sins are merely venial, or no sins at all. Thus the priests prophecy lies; the people love to have it so; and thousands annually go down to the grave with a lie in their mouths.

THE

# Protestant,

No. LXXXVII.

---

SATURDAY, MARCH 11th, 1820.

---

It is imperiously required of every Papist that he confess his sins to a priest at least once every year. I showed in my last Number, that if this order were literally observed, every sinner would require to have a priest of his own; and that both he and the priest would have enough to do, though they minded nothing else, from the end of one year to the end of another. The man who believes it to be possible to confess at one sitting, or rather at one kneeling, the sins of twelve months, must have a very different notion of what sin is from the representations which the word of God gives of it; and in fact, he has the authority of the church, which he considers infallible, for regarding the most part of those things which the Bible calls sins, as mere peccadilloes, not worthy of being remembered, much less of being punished, either by God or man.

I need not stop to expose the error of this doctrine; the error is manifest to every man who reads his Bible, and who understands but the first principles of the word of God. My present object is to prove the fact, that the church of Rome teaches the doctrine that some sins are only venial, while others, and these but few in number, are esteemed mortal; and that, having persuaded her blinded adherents to believe this impious absurdity, she allows them to rest satisfied with having made a confession, though it should not embrace one in ten thousand of their real transgressions.

Thus the words of the Council of Trent, (Sess. 14. cap. 6.) are, "that this confession of *mortal* sin be very exact and particular;" which leaves it to be inferred, that sins, which are not considered mortal, need not be confessed at all; and as every sinner is disposed to think his own sins but venial, at least the greater part of them, he will have but few mortal ones to confess; no more in ordinary cases, in the course of a year, than he can detail to his priest, with all their aggravations, in an hour.

The Douay catechism is honourably explicit on this subject.

It reduces the *deadly* or *capital* sins to seven in number. To these, of course, a penitent may restrict his confession ; and if he cannot accuse himself of any of these, he has no confession to make. He has only to declare himself as innocent as on the day of his baptism, by which rite he believes he was cleansed from original sin, and to demand the body of his Creator in the sacrament of his body and blood, it being necessary, in order to the reception of this, that a man be in a state of grace, that is, free from mortal sin. The seven deadly sins are, pride, covetousness, luxury, anger, gluttony, envy, and sloth. The French catechism issued by Buonaparte and the Pope, gives precisely the same number, with two slight verbal variations :—What the former calls luxury and sloth, the latter calls wantonness and idleness.

The Douay catechism has also six sins against the Holy Ghost ; but as they are not described as mortal, we must consider them as only venial. These are, despair of salvation, presumption of God's mercy, to impugn the known truth, envy at another's spiritual good, obstinacy in sin, and final impenitence. The grave authors of this catechism had already placed envy among the deadly sins, but here it appears among those which are distinguished from the deadly. This arises, I suppose, from the rule of the Council of Trent, which requires a particular regard to circumstances, especially such as *speciem facti mutant*, that is, alter the kind or degree of sin. It is envy in general that is a mortal sin ; but when it is only "envy at another's spiritual good," the species is altered ; and the sin becomes venial. If we take the word of God for our rule, we shall find that there is no sin so emphatically marked as deadly as that of final impenitence ; but the Douay doctors class this with sins which are not deadly, for no other reason that I know of, but that they have still a remedy for it in Purgatory.

There are four sins besides, which are particularly marked by the Douay divines in their catechism, which Amicus Veritatis says is approved by the whole church of Rome. These four sins are, wilful murder, sin of Sodom, oppression of the poor, and to defraud workmen of their wages. These are entitled, "the sins that cry to heaven for vengeance." But seeing they are not placed in the list of deadly sins, it may be presumed that their *cry* is not heard, that vengeance does not follow them, and therefore we must consider them as merely venial.

In this way Papists "sport themselves with their own deceptions." They are worse than the fools that make a mock at sin ; for they represent the most enormous wickedness as no sin at all, or as such a trifle that it would be unjust to punish men for it, at least with eternal punishment. Thus, in answer to the question, "What is venial sin ?" the Douay catechism answers,—"It

is a much more pardonable offence against God or our neighbour:” that is, more pardonable than the mortal sin which is explained immediately before. In short, the Council of Mentz professed plainly, “That they cannot understand how God should be just, if he punish any for venial sins with eternal punishment.” Sonnius, one of their authors, tells us, that “venial sins are *worthy of pardon* ;” that is making them *meritorious* : and Bellarmine, their great champion, declares, that they “hold with a general consent that venial sins make not a man guilty of eternal death.” “That God would be unjust if he punished venial sins eternally, justice requiring a forbearance to punish that offence which deserves not punishment.” Again, says the same author, “some sins are so far from deserving eternal punishment, that God *cannot* punish them eternally, without injustice.” Gregory de Valentia says, that “venial sin may be remitted without any infusion of grace.” Andradius and Bonaventure assert, “That for venial sins we do not so much as need repentance.” The Council of Mentz teach, “That many depart this life free from mortal sins, and for lighter sins they shall never be damned.” (See the quotations, and many more to the same purpose, in a Sermon by Mr. Jenkyn, entitled, “No sin venial.”)

Thus, from the published sentiments of their greatest authors, and from their approved catechisms, it will appear, that Papists need not much concern themselves about most of the sins of which they know themselves to be guilty ; nay that they may easily get quit of them all by persuading themselves of some circumstance which changes a mortal sin into a venial one ; or if this cannot be done, they have only to tell their deadly sins to a priest, who not only will, but who is *obliged* to grant absolution, if the sinner appear to be sorry for what he has done, and promise amendment. A little penance is enjoined as a thing of course, which the penitent may either suffer in person, or compound for by a little money, and then he is declared to be in a state of grace, as pure and innocent as when he came from the laver of regeneration, that is, from the holy water sprinkled on him at baptism.

I do not believe that the grossest heathenism is so much calculated to promote sin, and to keep men at ease under their sins, as this impious substitute for Christianity, which the church of Rome has palmed upon the world ; by means of which she has deceived the nations of Europe for so many ages, and led millions of souls to everlasting perdition. For let it be observed, that in the sins of her catalogue, there is no mention of that which is the root and the sum of all iniquity, namely, the want of love to God. A man may be unconscious of any of the seven deadly sins—of any of the six sins against the Holy Ghost ;—or of any

of the four that cry to heaven for vengeance ;—it may not be in the power of man to convict him of any one of these seventeen sins ; and yet he may be in the gall of bitterness, and the bond of iniquity, because the love of God is not in him ; and while his fellow creatures are regarding him as a saint, worthy to be canonized and adored, all the benevolence of heaven is looking down upon him with pity and compassion, as an enemy to God in his mind ; and as belonging to that description of men, for whom is reserved the blackness of darkness for ever.

The church of Rome endeavours, by every means in her power, to keep the eyes of men shut against this view of their character and state. She is constantly diverting their minds from reflecting upon the character of true religion, as consisting in love to God and to our fellow men, and as manifesting itself in spiritual worship, and holy practice. She has their minds pre-occupied, by a system of false religion and will-worship ; which is the more pernicious, and the more to be abhorred, because it assumes the name of Christianity. In this system, the love of God, which is the essence of true religion, is declared not to be necessary ; at least, not to be so necessary as that one cannot be a Christian without it.

I shall immediately prove this by quotations from distinguished writers of the church of Rome. These writers were Jesuits, and therefore their doctrines will have the greater weight with our British Papists ; for I wish the reader to recollect, that after this most pestilent Society had been proscribed by all the Popish powers in Europe, they found an asylum in the heart of England ; where, for thirty years past, they have been allowed to extend their influence, concentrate their powers, and mature their plans for bringing the world again in subjection to their ghostly dominion. The principal Popish writers of the present day in England, have avowed themselves on the side of the Jesuits ; the Pope himself, by his recent authoritative restoration of the order, has identified with them not only himself personally, but also the church of which he is the head ; and I have not a doubt, that if the Popish priests at present in Scotland and England would tell the truth, they would confess that they are Jesuits. I have not access to the original works from which the following extracts are taken ; but I give them as quoted by M. Pascal, who was a devoted and zealous member of the church of Rome ; but so amiable and so pious, that I cannot allow myself to call him a Papist.

In Escobar, says M. Pascal, (in his Provincial Letters, Let. X.) who has collected the various opinions of our Fathers on this subject, in the practice of the love of God by our Society, tr. 1. ex. 2. n. 21. and tr. 5. ex. 4. n. 8. you have this question. “ When, or at what time, is a man obliged to have an actual love



or affection for God? Suarez says, it is enough to love him a little before we die, without fixing any time. Vasquez, that it is enough to love him at the point of death. Others, at baptism; some, at the seasons of contrition; others, upon festivals. But our Father Castro Palao opposes, and justly too, every one of these opinions. Hurtado de Mendoza pretends to say, that we are obliged to love him once every year, and that we are well off, in not being obliged to love him oftener. But Father Conink believes that we are bound to do it once in three or four years. Henriquez, every five years. And Filiutius says, it is probable that we are not rigorously obliged to do it every five years."

Anthony Sirmond, another of their Fathers, discusses this doctrine in the manner following:—"St. Thomas says we are obliged to love God as soon as he has given us the use of reason: but that is a little too soon. Scotus, every Sunday. What foundation has he for that? Others, in times of strong temptation. Ay, if there was no other way to avoid it. Scotus, that after some great mercy received from God, it is not amiss to thank him for it. Others, at the point of death. That is a little too late. Neither do I believe it necessary every time that the sacraments are administered. Attrition with confession, if you can come at it conveniently, will do well enough. Suarez says, he is sure we are obliged to love God some time or other. Ay, but when? Why, you are to be judge of that, for he knows nothing of the matter."

On these sentiments of Jesuit authors, expressed in their own words, Pascal remarks, "Now if such a doctor as Suarez knows nothing of the matter, I do not know who does. And he concludes at last, that in strictness, we are only obliged to keep the other commandments without having any affection for God, or our hearts the least inclined to love him; provided we do not hate him; and this he proves throughout his whole second treatise. You will see in every page, but more particularly in the 16, 19, 24, and 28, where are these words: 'God, in commanding us to love him, is satisfied if we obey him in his other commandments.' If God had said, 'Though you keep my commandments ever so well, I will damn you, if you do not moreover give me your heart and affections;' do you think that this motive would have been proportioned to that end and design, which God may, and ought to have? It is therefore said that we shall love God, by doing his will, in the same manner as if we loved him affectionately, and had no other bias but that of charity itself. Should that be really the case, so much the better; but if not, we still do not fail strictly to obey the commandment of love, while we perform the works thereof: so that (observe the good-

ness of God) we are not so much commanded to love him as we are not to hate him."

"Thus have our Fathers (continues M. Pascal) discharged men from the *painful* obligation of loving God with all their hearts. And this doctrine is of that importance, that Fathers Annat, Pintereau, Le Moine, and even A. Sirmond, have stoutly defended it whenever it was attacked; as you may see in their answers to the Moral Theology, but particularly in that of Father Pintereau, 2. p. of Abbe de Boisc, p. 53. where you may judge of the value of this dispensation by the price which it cost, which was no less than the blood of Jesus Christ. But what crowns this doctrine is, that it sets you free from the troublesome duty of loving God, which is the great privilege which the Christians have above the Jews. 'It was reasonable,' says he, 'that by the law of grace in the New Testament, God should take off the troublesome and difficult duties of the law of rigour, which obliged men to acts of perfect contrition, before they could be justified; and that he should institute certain sacraments, to supply all our defects, by the help of means more easy to be performed: otherwise Christians, who are the children, could not more easily recover the good graces of their Father, than the Jews who were the slaves, could obtain mercy from their God.'

In short, the sum of the Jesuits' doctrine on this subject is thus shortly given by Pascal: "That this exemption from loving God is the great benefit, or advantage, which Jesus Christ has brought down upon the earth;" and then he expresses his indignation against the doctrine thus inculcated by the leading men of his own church, in the following language, which would do honour to any Protestant:—"What! will the blood of Jesus Christ procure us an exemption from loving him? Before the incarnation, mankind were obliged to love God, but since God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son; shall the world, thus mercifully redeemed by him, be discharged from loving him? Strange divinity of our times! To dare to take off the curse that St. Paul pronounces against those who love not the Lord Jesus! To destroy what St. John says, That he that loveth not, remaineth in death. Nay, what Jesus Christ himself affirms, 'He that loveth me not, keepeth not my commandments.' Thus you make those worthy to enjoy God through all eternity, who never once loved him in the whole course of their lives. This is the mystery of iniquity complete! Open your eyes at last, my good Father, and if the former errors of your casuists are not discernible enough to strike you, may these last withdraw you, by their glaring impieties," *Vol. 1. p. 227. ed. 1744.*

Here I shall indulge myself in a short digression, to show the reader in what manner the Jesuits of that day treated this faithful

exposure of their impieties, and the then unknown author, who published his Letters one by one, at intervals. They found it impossible to defend themselves by fair argument; and they had recourse to a weapon which their society, in every stage of its existence, has been found to handle more dexterously than any other body of men in the world; that is, lying, downright impudent lying, and calumny. Thus the author of the Provincial Letters, who was a man really concerned for the honour of his church, was assailed by the Jesuits with every opprobrious epithet; and, to express in one word all the crimes of which they accused him, they called him a HERETIC; and, supposing him to belong to the Society of Port Royal, they accused the whole body, nuns and all, with heresy, particularly of "disbelieving the mystery of transubstantiation, and the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist." This had no connexion with the subjects in dispute; for the author of the Letters was a firm believer in that absurdity; but it seems to have been intended, and it had the effect of diverting his mind, at least for a time, from exposing the impiety of their doctrines; for we find he entered immediately on his own defence, which occupies a considerable part of his second volume. In this defence, however, he makes a most pointed exposure of the wickedness of these fathers.

"I shall not only prove," says he, "that your writings are full of scandal, but I shall go farther. It is possible to say a thing that is false, believing it to be true; but the real liar is he that lies with an intention to lie. Now I shall make it appear that you, Fathers, lie with that intention; and that you load your enemies, knowingly and designedly, with crimes of which you positively know that they are innocent."—"For this doctrine of evil speaking is so notorious in your schools, that you have not only maintained it in your books, but, with the most consummate impudence, in your public disputations; as, amongst others, in those at Louvain, in the year 1645, in these terms. It is but a venial sin to ruin the credit of a false accuser, by charging him with false crimes: and this doctrine is so much in vogue with you, that whoever dares to attack it, you treat him as an ignorant fool-hardy fellow."

A capuchin friar who had been accused by the Jesuits in the same manner, is introduced as making the following defence:—"I have stopped their impudence once before, and I will do it again, in the same manner. I declare therefore to all the world that they (the Jesuits) are MOST IMPUDENT LIARS: *Mentiri impudentissime*. If the things they accuse me of be true, let them be proved, or let my accusers from henceforth and for ever stand convicted of a most IMPUDENT LIE. After this challenge, all men will see who is in the right, they or I."—"This honest

capuchin, Fathers, has cut off from your reverences all possibility of making a retreat. You are now convicted of being professed detractors, and must defend yourselves by your maxim, that this kind of calumny is no crime at all. This father has found out the way of stopping your mouths; and indeed it is the only way, whenever your accusations want proof. The best answer to every one of you, is that of the Capuchin father, *MENTIRIS IMPUDENTISSIME.*" Such is the character of the Jesuits, drawn, not by a heretical Protestant, but by a brother of their own communion, who knew them well.

The reader will be apt to think that I have lost sight of the subject of Auricular Confession; but this is not the case. I wish to expose, as plainly as I can, the notions which Papists entertain with regard to sin, in order to a better understanding of what they call their sacramental confession. If they knew sin in its true character, as it is described in the word of God, they would see that it is impossible for a fellow creature to hear a true confession of it, or to grant absolution; and if by any means they should acquire this knowledge, it would ruin the trade of their father confessors, who are, therefore, directly interested in maintaining false notions of sin, and distracting the minds of the people with distinctions of sins venial and mortal; which they do in such an equivocal and quibbling manner, that they can make any sin belong to the one class, or to the other, according to the disposition of the sinner's mind, or according to the weight of his purse, and his willingness to part with its contents for the good of the church.

The above extracts confirm the truth of some of my remarks in the early part of my work, in which I convicted Popery of representing the Father of mercies as a cruel tyrant. It is only because Papists look upon him in this light, that they can entertain the question for a moment, as a subject of discussion, whether, and how often, they are bound to love him? If they did not regard him with aversion, they could never think of the benefit of being exempted from loving him; and they would never speak of the love of God as a *painful* obligation.

Their doctrine, however, is deeply rooted in human nature. "The carnal mind is enmity against God;" and it is one of the radical vices of Popery, that she professes to save men in their natural state of depravity, by means of her sacraments, which are declared to produce the miraculous effect of reconciling men to God, while yet there is no real change produced in the state of their minds towards God. This accounts for all the nonsense and blasphemy of the Popish writers on the subjects of sin, confession, and absolution, which I have given in this, and intend to give in my future Numbers.

THE

# Protestant,

No. LXXXVIII.

---

SATURDAY, MARCH 18th, 1820.

---

TO love God with all our heart, and soul, and mind, and strength, and our neighbour as ourselves, is the sum of true religion; but Popery teaches that it is not necessary to love God, except on some extraordinary occasions; and that if we were under obligation to love him at all times, Christians, who are the children of God, would be no better of than the Jews, who were his slaves. It will scarcely be credited, that a doctrine so horribly impious can be held by men even in the lowest state of depravity; but for the truth of what I assert, I refer the reader to the words of their own great divines and casuists which I gave in my last Number, upon the authority of Pascal, one of the greatest, and, I suppose, one of the best men that the church of Rome ever produced.

I proceed now to show, that, by the authority of the same casuists, Papists are also relieved from the obligation of loving their neighbour; and thus being made free from the *painful obligation* of obeying the two commandments on which hang all the law and the prophets, the reader will perceive that the confession of sin, which they have to make to their priests once a year, must be a very light and trivial matter. I am aware that the authority of Escobar, and Suarez, and Filiutius, and Bauny, and Emanuel Sa, and Bellarmine, and all the rest, jointly and severally, is not so great as that of a General Council; but I know at the same time, that the authority of any one of them is great enough to direct the conscience and the conduct of a Papist, if the opinion which he gives on any point of morals be a probable one; and any man may consider as probable whatever he pleases, or whatever may serve his present purpose.

The duty of love to our neighbour is detailed and enjoined in the second table of the law, which commences with the duty of love to parents and superiors. Let us see now how the Jesuits dispense with this troublesome duty. "For what concerns love, Dicastillus saith, that it is not altogether certain, that a child

can lawfully desire the death of his father, or rejoice in it, because of the inheritance that may come to him thereby; but he believes that he *sins not mortally* in rejoicing, not in his death considered as an evil to his father, but as a lawful means appointed of God, for him to obtain the succession; not because some evil befel the father, but some good to the son." Tambourin, who wrote after Dicastillus, delivers the doctrine with more confidence. "If you desire the death of your father upon some condition, the answer is easy, that *you may lawfully*. For if one say in himself, if my father should die, I should enjoy his estate; in this case he should not rejoice in his father's death, but in his inheritance." Again, "I desire the death of my father, not because it is an evil to him, but because it is good for me, or because it is the cause of good unto me; and because by this his death, I enter into the possession of my paternal inheritance." I suppose it did not occur to this grave and reverend father, that, according to this *holy* doctrine, a younger brother might lawfully desire his death; and that what it is lawful to desire, it is also lawful to effect, if one be able, and have an opportunity.

Hear again this said Tambourin, in reply to the following question:—"May an inferior desire the death of his superior, in the church or commonwealth, that he may succeed to his office, or that he may be delivered from him, because he favours him not?" Answer:—"If you desire only to receive with joy the effect of this death, to wit, the inheritance of a father, the charge of a prelate, the deliverance from some trouble he procured you, the answer is easy, that you may desire all these things lawfully, and that because you rejoice not in the evil of another, but in your own proper good." Here again, I take it for granted, that what it is lawful to desire, it is lawful to do; and by this casuistry of the Jesuits, it is lawful for any person to dispatch his superior in church or state, if he favours him not.

I have before me a folio volume of such morality, which was collected and arranged by a grave doctor of the church of Rome, not with approbation indeed, but with the most decided disapprobation. The work is entitled "*The Jesuits' Morals*, collected by a doctor of the College of Sorbonne in Paris; who hath faithfully extracted them out of the Jesuits' own books, which are printed by the permission and approbation of the superiors of their society." This doctor of the Sorbonne was evidently a Jansenist, a sect, in comparison with the Jesuits, of little account in the church of Rome; for with all her boasted unity, the church of Rome has been as fruitful in sects directly opposed to each other, as Protestants have been at any period. He gives the very words of his authors, in the original Latin, with the most particular references, so that there can be no doubt, with

regard to his authorities. The passages above quoted will be found in pages 298, 299, of his work.

He shews, from a great number of passages, that the Fathers of the Jesuits, hold it lawful to commit murder in a variety of cases. "It is lawful," says Lessius, "for an honourable person to kill an assailant, who would strike him with a cudgel, or give him a box on the ear to affront him, if he cannot otherwise avoid the disgrace. This may be proved; first, because if one attempt to damnify me in my honour and reputation, by smiting me with a cudgel, or giving me a box on the ear, I may betake me to my arms to keep him off; and by consequence, I have the very same right, if he endeavour to do me some wrong by reproaching me: for it is of small consideration, what means are made use of to do me an injury, if I be hurt as much the one way as the other. In the second place, recourse may be had to arms to hinder an affront; and so also to silence reproaches. In the third place, the danger of losing honour is equal to that of losing life. But it is lawful to kill, to avoid the peril of losing life; and by consequence also for avoiding the danger of losing honour." Again, "if one may kill for fear of losing his money, he may also, for fear of taking an affront." page 305. Our modern men of honour, the fighters of duels, must all have been trained in the school of the Jesuits.

Another grave author pleads for the privilege of the clergy, in the following words:—"That we cannot at least deny that clergymen and friars may, and even are obliged, to defend their honour and reputation, which proceeds from virtue and prudence; because this honour doth appertain to their profession, and that if they lose it, they lose a very great benefit and advantage." "It follows, that it will be lawful, for a clergyman, or a monk, to kill a slanderer, who threatens to publish some great crimes against him, or his order, if he have no other means to defend himself therefrom." "You have read," says this author, "the doctrine of Amicus, and you demand whether a monk, that hath sinned through frailty of the flesh, with a woman of base condition, who takes it for an honour to be prostitute to so great a personage, boasts herself of it, and defames him, may kill this woman? I know not what to answer. It is true, I have heard an excellent Father, a doctor in divinity, of great wit and learning, say, that Amicus might well have forborne to propound this proposition; but it being once published in print, he was obliged to maintain it, and we to defend him. This doctrine indeed is probable, and *a monk may kill a woman with whom he hath sinned, for fear she should defame him.*" page 313. I could fill half-a-dozen of Numbers with extracts from Escobar, and other Fathers, all to the same purpose. I cannot, however, pollute my

pages with what these Fathers have written upon the seventh, that is, what they call the sixth, commandment. By their casuistry, they allow persons to be as wicked as they please, provided they do not take pleasure in actions *as wicked*. By what they call directing the intention, a man may commit the greatest crimes, and be guilty of no more than venial sin, or not even so much.

According to the same authors, theft is a harmless thing. Thus Emanuele Sa teaches: "He who in taking what is another's, doth him no prejudice, because he made no use of it, and was not like to use it, is not obliged to restitution." Escobar asks, "If a man, after many small thefts, hath taken the last halfpenny which makes up a great theft, whereof he thereby becomes guilty, be obliged to restore all the sum, which was composed of these petty thefts?" to which he replies, "He is not obliged, under mortal sin, to make restitution of all the sum, but only part, which being taken off, the theft would be no more criminal." page 341.

The Jesuits have applied all their skill to evade the force of the ninth commandment. Lying is as necessary for the support of Popery, as meat and drink are for the support of our bodies. It is therefore indispensable, that it be considered only a venial sin, or in most cases, no sin at all. Dicastillus demands, "Whether he be obliged to retract, who hath affirmed some falsity which will cost the loss of life, or member, to another, when the witness by his retraction will incur the same penalty?" and answers; "That he believes that if the false witness have not sinned mortally by bearing this false testimony, he is not obliged, after understanding the truth, to retract what he had said, so exposing himself to great evils." Hurtado teaches, and Tambourin approves it, that "a scholar, having need to prove that he had gone through his course, and having need of two witnesses hereof, may employ therein two of his friends who have not seen him go to the lectures, but are sufficiently persuaded that he did attend them: but they may not *swear* for all that, that they have seen him go." page 346. That is, they may not swear, but they may *affirm* what they do not know to be true; and we shall see presently that these doctors do not look upon a false oath as a mortal sin.

Filiutius instances, in the case of promises and oaths, speaking of one who promised something outwardly, without intention of performing, "For if one ask him if he have promised, he may say no, intending that he had not promised, by any promise that obliged him; and by consequence he may also *swear*, for otherwise he should be constrained to pay what he owes not." Sanchez, speaking of the same thing, says, "All the difficulty is reduced to this, to know if he that hath sworn had an intent to



swear, but not be obliged in swearing, if he be truly obliged?" After reporting the opinions and the reasons of those who hold that the oath obliges, he adds; "The second opinion which I hold more probable, holds, that in this case the oath obliges not at all." page 47. By this rule a man may swear to any thing, and yet not be bound; for it was only his intention to take the oath, but not to be bound by it. "If you be assured," says Tambourin, "that you have made a vow, or an oath, and you doubt whether you had an intent to oblige yourself, or if the words which you used in your oath contained an invocation of God, at least a tacit one, I believe it is probable that you are not obliged to keep it."

Considering all these things, the reader must be convinced, that confession in the church of Rome must be a very easy matter; and that most persons will have very few sins to confess. There is not one of the divine commandments, by which a person can be convicted of mortal sin, though he had transgressed them all a thousand times in the course of the year, if he be but ingenious enough to apply the doctrine of intention to all his actions. He may have desired the death of his father or of his civil superior; he may have killed the man who had affronted, or designed to affront him, and the woman who had it in her power to divulge his wickedness; he may have embezzled the property of another; and he may have invented a thousand lies in order to ruin his neighbour, if he had but a suspicion that his neighbour had an ill will towards him: in short, he may have been a habitual blasphemer, and murderer, and adulterer, and thief, and liar, and yet be held not guilty of any mortal sin, because he did not these things, taking pleasure in them *as sins*, but for some desirable and necessary purpose. When he goes to confession, he may tell his priest why and wherefore he did such things; and if his confessor be a Jesuit, he will admit the force of every extenuating circumstance, and, according to the morality of his order, exact no more in the way of penance than what he may consider agreeable to the penitent himself.

Besides, persons in meaner circumstances, who do not stand so high in the esteem of the Jesuits as the rich and the great, may get over the painful duty of confession very easily, if they will go to the priest at the season of the year when he has most work on his hands, or if they will only be at the pains to concert matters with their poor neighbours, so as to go to the priest in forties or fifties at a time; for he must hear them all separately; and the Jesuits have a rule, that when they have many penitents to attend to, they need not be very particular in rummaging the conscience of any one of them. Thus Bauny teaches: "That if any one of ignorance or simplicity confess his faults only in gross,

without determinately expressing any one of them in particular, there is no need to draw from his mouth the repetition of those faults, if it cannot conveniently be done ; because the confessor is pressed with penitents that give him not leisure for it."

The priest, however, is empowered to grant absolution of the penitent's sins, though he should not have heard of what nature they are, and this absolution is as effectual as if he had heard a confession of them all, with every symptom of deep sorrow on the part of the penitent. It is not, however, necessary, in ordinary cases, that a penitent should be very sorrowful on account of his sins. Some of the above cited fathers teach that contrition is indeed a desirable thing, if one can come at it ; but if not, they say that attrition is enough. Now this word attrition does not signify sorrow for sin as displeasing to God ; but only such sorrow as arises from the fear of punishment. It is quite consistent with a state of mind at enmity against God ; and yet with this hatred of God in their hearts, the priest grants them the pardon of all their sins, and sends them away with the belief that God has pardoned them too ; and that if they were to die immediately, they would certainly go to heaven, either directly, or by way of purgatory. Every intelligent Christian must be convinced that this doctrine could proceed only from the father of lies, and the enemy of men's souls.

In order to absolution, it is indeed required in ordinary cases, that the penitent should *resolve* to forsake his sins and lead a new life ; but it is not in all cases necessary that this resolution be sincere, or that there be a probability of his fulfilling it. Father Bauny confesses that " oftentimes it be supposed that such resolutions come but from the teeth outwards." Emanuel Sa says the same thing, and adds, " we may absolve him who resolves to abstain from sin, though he himself believe that he shall not hold his resolution." Again, says the same father, " that he may be absolved, who from just and reasonable cause will not quit the occasion of sin, provided he make a firm resolution that he will not sin any more ; though he have already relapsed thereinto many times." *Just* and *reasonable* cause for not quitting occasion of sin, is elsewhere explained to be, going into bad company for the sake of doing them good, though the person doing so have reason from former experience to suspect that they will lead him to sin, rather than that he shall lead them to forsake it. Again, Father Bauny teaches, " If, notwithstanding all that they have said and promised to their confessor in times past, they cannot forbear to break out into excess and greater liberty in the very same faults as before, they ought to be admitted to the sacrament, and may be absolved."—" That the penitent purposing with true affection, and resorting to the feet of the priest

to put an end to his sins, deserves to receive pardon though he amend not." Dicastillus speaks without hesitation on this subject :—" that after it is experimented that he amends not at all, and after it is known that the penitent hath no will to quit the occasions, absolution may be given him. And when there is some reasonable cause why the penitent should not separate himself from the occasion of sin, though the penitent have relapsed into it very frequently, he is not to be obliged to avoid it, nor to be deprived of absolution, though his relapses be very frequent ; he ought on the contrary to be exhorted to come frequently to confession." See *Jesuits' Morals*, pages 211—213.

Thus it appears that sin is the staple commodity of traffic in the church of Rome. It is by this that she has her wealth ; and if persons were not perpetually sinning, and professing to repent at least once a-year, the priests might shut shop. The greatest sinner is in fact the best customer ; and, as in the case last cited, one who relapses very frequently, must not be obliged to avoid sin, or the occasion of it ; he must rather be exhorted to come more frequently to confession ; and as he must not come empty handed, the greater sinner he is, he is so much the better member of the holy church.

I expect to hear that our British Papists reject the authority of the great Fathers from whose writings I have made such liberal extracts. They will plead that the Jesuit casuists were not the " Catholic Church," and that therefore what they teach is not necessarily catholic doctrine. I might, perhaps, admit the plea, if it were urged by any other church than that of Rome ; but as she firmly maintains, that all her priests are, in virtue of their ordination, successors of the apostles, and endowed with the authority of apostles to declare the word of God and the true meaning of the scriptures with infallible certainty, she has no right to object to any doctrine which her priests may inculcate. Every lay person is in fact bound, under pain of anathema, to receive and hold fast whatever his priest may tell him on matters of faith. This is not the case in Protestant churches. In them every member is exhorted to read the Bible, and judge for himself ; and to receive nothing from the mouth of any man except what he finds supported by the word of God. It is quite otherwise in the church of Rome, in which it is declared unlawful to exercise private judgment ; and that every man must, under pain of damnation, receive implicitly what is taught by his priest. Besides, the works from which the above extracts are made contain not the sentiments of mere individual priests ; they have the sanction of the superiors of the order of Jesuits, which is virtually the sanction of the whole body, not of the Jesuits only, but of the whole church, of which they are the most active agents and defenders.

I will shew farther, that whatever the more consistent Papists of Spain and Portugal may plead on this subject, those in Britain are fairly committed as identifying themselves with the Jesuits. The *Orthodox Journal*, which is declared by itself to be now the only "Catholic Journal" in Britain, in the Number which has just reached me, speaks of the Jesuits as the most meritorious order with which the church was ever blessed; and ascribes all the evils which have befallen Europe, during the last thirty years, to the suppression of the order; for such was their *pure morality*, and other good qualities, that had they not been suppressed, the French Revolution would probably not have taken place, and all its bitter consequences would have been prevented. This is the avowed opinion of the public organ of the English Papists, who is known to write under the patronage of a right reverend Vicar Apostolic, and who may be presumed to have the concurrence of the great body of his brethren. Let us hear, then, his account of the Society of Jesuits:—

"The admirable constitution by which this renowned order was governed, shewed the knowledge which its sainted founder had of human nature. By its rules, ambition, jealousy, and vain glory, were unknown among the disciples of Loyola, because there was no chance whatever left them to gratify these inordinate passions of the heart." It seems to be a rule with all Popish writers, to disavow most peremptorily those vices of which they are most notoriously guilty; and thus, it seems, the Jesuits could not be accused of *ambition*, though their object was no less than to have the direction of all the governments in Christendom, and ultimately of the whole world.

I have not room for one half of what this writer says in praise of the Jesuits; but it may come in my way again.

I beg leave to recommend to the reader a small pamphlet just published, entitled, "God's revenge against Rebellion; an historical Poem: with copious notes, illustrative of the present state of Ireland: Occasioned by a late edict from Rome, and a circular letter of a titular Bishop in the west of Ireland, against Bibles and Protestant Schoolmasters. By the Rev. John Graham, M. A." This Poem was addressed to *THE PROTESTANT*, but being too large for insertion in his work, he recommended its separate publication. It contains a great deal of information with regard to the present state of Ireland, and the mischiefs occasioned by Popery in that unhappy country. It may be had of all the Booksellers, price sixpence. I am indebted to the Author for many other valuable communications, particularly the Poem inserted in my 81st and 86th Numbers.

---

*Errata* in Mr. Graham's Pastoral Letter from Rome in No. 86, page 284, line 14, for *confident* read *confidant*; line 34, for *Papal walls*, read *Papal bulls*.

THE  
**Protestant,**

No. LXXXIX.

---

SATURDAY, MARCH 25th, 1820.

---

THE following letter contains only one paragraph on auricular confession, which is my present subject of discussion; but that paragraph, which contains the testimony of a living credible witness, is worth fifty arguments in order to demonstrate the wickedness of Popery in this matter alone. Indeed, the whole letter is so very interesting, that I am sure the reader will thank me for interrupting the course of my argument in order to give place to it.

“ TO THE PROTESTANT.

“ *Lillieslief, 12th February, 1820.*

“ MY DEAR SIR,

“ WHILE the facts I am now going to state, will form my apology for troubling you with this long letter, they will show you that I must feel a more than ordinary interest in the admirable work which you are carrying on, under title of “THE PROTESTANT.”

“ I am a native of Ireland; and was brought up in the profession of Christianity, as taught by the ministers of the church of Rome, until about the beginning of the 18th year of my age. In my early years, I was favoured with a better education than Papists generally give their children in that ill-fated, but admirable country. Protestants forming a large portion of the community, the Bible was among us a common school-book: this is a circumstance for which I can never be sufficiently grateful; for although I did not then understand the will of God as revealed in the Bible, the repeated perusal of it rendered its language and sentiments familiar to my mind; and the knowledge which I thus acquired was afterwards of great use to me.

“ In my 16th year, I was, by the advice of my parents and the priest, admitted to the communion of the church. I had then,

and once afterwards, a specimen of "auricular confession:" to these two events in my life, I look back with horror! If auricular confession be at all times conducted as it was when I engaged in it, I have no hesitation in saying, that I consider it one of the most abominable and corrupting institutions of Popery. If the person confessing hesitates for a moment, through defect of memory, or through the feelings of shame, the father confessor proposes a leading question on the various kinds and degrees of iniquity and thus stimulates the reluctant devotee, and drags from him or her the inmost secrets of the heart. To say a single word in explanation of the questions which a father confessor will thus propose to a young man or a young woman, to a husband or a wife, would be to imitate his vile example. You will perceive, at a single glance, that they tend to increase the knowledge of the young and simple in the ways of transgression, and to render vices, of the most injurious and disgusting kind, familiar to all.

"About the time I have already mentioned, a Protestant friend lent me three sermons, which he had bought from some person selling tracts. These sermons are by three men whose praise is deservedly great in the churches of Christ—Thomas Boston, E. and R. Erskine. The sermon by Mr. Boston is called "The Everlasting Espousals," on these words, (Hosea ii. 19) "I will betroth thee unto me for ever;" the one by Mr. Ebenezer Erskine, is called "The Plant of Renown," on Ezekiel xxxiv. 29; and the one by Ralph Erskine, is on Isaiah xlv. 11. In the sermon by E. Erskine, the person and work of Jesus Christ as Mediator, are exhibited with great force and accuracy; in the sermon by Mr. Boston, the way in which the people of God are brought into his family, and made partakers of its blessings, are delineated in the peculiar manner of that able and evangelical writer; and in the sermon by R. Erskine, there is a full account of the high privilege of believers, in being allowed at all times to approach into the presence of their God and Father, through Jesus the only Mediator, to supplicate those things which are promised to them, and of which they have need.

"The perusal of these sermons produced a deep and painful impression upon my mind. All my former views of religion were distracted and confounded; and new views of sin and duty, were forcibly pressed upon my attention. In these sermons, the Scriptures seemed to me to speak a new language, and to present to my mind an entirely new scene of contemplation: they certainly set before me the ground of a sinner's hope of pardon and acceptance with God, in a light directly opposite to that in which I was formerly taught to view them. But although I was by the perusal of these sermons surprised and confounded, I was not convinced. I determined to read them again with my Bible in my

hand ; and I did so, comparing every opinion of the writer every passage which they quoted in support of their opinions, with the oracles of God. This second perusal increased the pain I felt in a very high degree. From the Scriptures I found I could not refute the doctrines taught in these sermons ; and to admit these doctrines to be true, was, according to the lessons I had been taught from my infancy, to expose myself to all the horrors of eternal damnation. In this state of mind I knew not what to do. I dared not consult my parents ; for to do so, I certainly knew was to bring upon me their high displeasure, and perhaps all the sarcasm and censures of my ghostly father ; and to apply to any Protestant, I felt was in some measure to commit myself, without being fully persuaded in my own mind. Thus matters proceeded with me for some time. I read the Scriptures, and some Protestant books which I procured from the same friend, most attentively ; offered up frequent and fervent prayers to Almighty God for light to perceive, and courage to persevere, in the way of duty ; and often went to hear the sermons of some Presbyterian ministers in the neighbourhood. While proceeding in this tenor of conduct, I found light gradually shed on my mind, and I thought I began in some measure to perceive the way in which I ought to go.

“By the manner in which I had for some time conducted myself, I had attracted the attention of my mother. Observing my absence from mass, and hearing of my attendance at Protestant places of worship, she began to dread the very worst of me, that a Popish parent can dread of a child—heresy. It was on a Sabbath morning that she first spoke to me on the subject. She began by asking me, “if I was going that day with the rest of the family to prayers?” At that moment my whole frame shook ; and, through fear and anxiety, I found myself wholly unable to speak. I had long wished for such an opportunity as this, to speak to my tender-hearted and affectionate mother, on a subject that engrossed my whole attention ; and yet, when it presented itself to me unexpectedly, I found myself quite unable. She saw my confusion, and was grieved to the heart. The sorrow I saw in her face was the first thing that roused me from the stupor into which I had sunk ; and I said to her, “No—I am not going with the rest of the family to prayers to day.” She said, “Why?” I had been reading in the New Testament when this conversation commenced, and holding it out to her, I said—“Because I find no authority for mass in this book.” She quickly asked what book it was, I was reading ? and I told her. She then felt all that a tender-hearted affectionate Roman Catholic mother could feel in such circumstances ; and I find, Sir, 19 years after this interview, that I have not nerves to proceed with the story of it.

“Of the part I had now acted, the priest was soon informed; and, with the mild and merciful spirit of his order, he passed sentence upon me, without ever condescending to converse with me, and without ever making a single effort to enlighten my mind, and reclaim me from my supposed heresy. The sentence which he passed, as I was informed, was, “That I was a heretic, and must be banished from the family;” sagely adding, “That the clean must be kept from the unclean.” This sentence, though communicated to me, my parents, influenced by strong affection, hesitated to carry into execution. But a Popish priest knows nothing about parental affection, and cares far less about it, in such a case as this. He therefore repeated the sentence, and accompanied the repetition with considerations fitted to command an immediate compliance. A Popish priest in Ireland is never at a loss for considerations to influence the conduct of his flock, in matters connected with their religion. In obedience, therefore, to the repeated commands of a man who called himself a minister of the gospel of peace, and who professed himself a disciple of the meek and lowly Jesus, I was banished from my father’s house, for no crime—but the crime of desiring to worship the God that made me, according to the dictates of my conscience!

“I believe my parents thought that the very attempt to banish me from the family, would bring me to an immediate submission; and that they, on that account, yielded the more easily to the commands of the priest. In the affair my father took no direct hand: the painful task devolved upon my mother; and I believe was devolved upon her, in the hope that her tenderness and affection would so work upon my feelings, that I would not be able to part with her. On the day fixed for this banishment, she rolled up a small parcel of linens, and desired me, with an aching heart, to accompany her on a short journey. I did so; and when about a mile from the village, she stopped suddenly, and made the last appeal to my feelings. She did every thing which reasoning, and prayers, and tears could do, to induce me to return to the bosom of that church out of which she believed, and declared, there is no salvation. I felt deeply and wept bitterly; but God enabled me to remain faithful. After some minutes of great suffering on both sides, we parted; and I was not permitted for about two years, to enter my father’s house, although I had often occasion to pass very near to it. At the time I have now mentioned, a man who had more sagacity, and more of the milk of human kindness in his constitution, than many of his brethren, and who had stood sponsor for me when I was baptized, interfered, as he had a right to do, according to the principles of his church, in my behalf. He called on my parents, and, I believe, on the priest, and reasoned with him very seriously about the manner in which



they had dealt with me. He charged them with harshness and cruelty; and declared that the treatment I had received, was more fitted to harden, than reclaim any human being. Through this interference I was again permitted to visit my father's family. Of this permission I immediately availed myself; and though I have not since resided with my parents, we have still been on a very friendly footing, and carry on a friendly correspondence. After an absence of 9 years, I paid them a visit last harvest, and met with a reception full of parental kindness and affection.

"After my banishment from my father's house, the Lord provided for my temporal support in a manner wonderfully gracious. "When my father and my mother forsook me, then the Lord took me up." Indeed, Sir, when I look back, which I frequently do, upon the way by which God has led me, I must consider myself, in a peculiar manner, a child of Providence. He has often brought me, while blind, by a way which I knew not, and led me in paths that I had not known: he has often made darkness light before me, and crooked things straight. But how pleasing soever to my own mind, I must quit this part of my story, as in some measure foreign to the design of this letter.

"My chief difficulty at this time arose from an inquiry very natural in my circumstances. This inquiry was, "With whom shall I now join in worshipping God?" A Papist I could no longer be. The harsh and cruel manner in which I had been treated, made an indelible impression upon my heart; and convinced me, that persons capable of acting as Papists had acted towards me, were destitute of the spirit and the faith of Christ. But the treatment I had received was not the thing which chiefly influenced me against Popery and Papists: the thing which chiefly influenced me against them was, their direct opposition, in almost all the great matters of faith and practice, to the Scriptures of truth. This direct opposition appeared to me most striking, on the atonement and intercession of Christ, on the doctrines of justification and sanctification, on faith and repentance, and on the respect due to the Virgin Mary, and other reputed saints. On these, and on many other things, I was then, and I am still, of opinion, that Papists are directly opposed to the unerring oracles of God.

"But although I had renounced Popery, there was much of Popery in my views and feelings. I was, to a certain extent, a Protestant; but having emerged from a region of thick darkness, I was not able to form an accurate notion of many things connected with Protestantism. I well remember that nothing perplexed me more, than to form a just notion of what is meant in the New Testament, by the word "church." From my infancy I had been taught to consider the "church" a mysteri-

ous something—made up of I knew not, and never was told, what—possessing the attributes of holiness, unity, and infallibility. But when I viewed Protestantism as set before me in Ireland, broken down into so many opposing fragments, I could see no such “church” as the one to which my mind had been familiar from my youth. This circumstance embarrassed me much; and to increase my embarrassment, those Papists with whom I had occasion to converse, dwelt with unrelenting severity on the subject. It did not then occur to me, that the “church” of Christ is composed of believers in his person and work, of different ages and countries—and sometimes different from each other, in the peculiar features of their character, and in many of their opinions; but all agreeing about the great articles of our holy religion, all united to the same Saviour, partakers of the same grace, and expectants of the same glorious immortality. The thing for which I looked, and which I always expected, was a visible organized body, which was exclusively the church of Christ, and concerning which all that is said in Scripture might be fulfilled. —I have dwelt the more fully on this matter, because I know it is one of the great stumbling-blocks of Papists, and one of the means most successfully employed to keep them in the darkness of Popery; and because it tended, for many months, to embitter my own existence. Having a firm hold of my mind (as indeed all the dogmas of Popery have on the minds of those who believe them,) I was not able, for about two years, to get wholly rid of it; and so become a member of some Protestant community. During this period, I continued to worship sometimes with one class of Protestants, and sometimes with another, until my views of divine truth became clearer, and I found a body of Christians with whom I could join in religious fellowship. This I did with one, with which I am still connected.

“I have just now mentioned, that all the dogmas of Popery have a firm hold of the minds of those who believe them. As I deem facts of far more use to you than reasonings, I will here give you my own experience; and I presume what I am now going to state, will lead you to conclude, that there may be many Papists convinced of the falsehood and absurdity of many of the doctrine which they are taught, but who dare not give way to their convictions. Long after I had renounced Popery, and was perfectly convinced of the falsehood and absurdity of its peculiar tenets, I have, on a moment’s reflection on what I had done, felt my whole frame shudder. At such a moment, I have involuntarily trembled from head to foot, as if I had leaped a tremendous precipice, into which I was in danger of falling backward. Such horror of mind, and such convulsion, of my whole frame, were most frequently excited, by a very trifling and absurd doctrine of

the Popish church. This doctrine is, "that it is sinful to eat flesh on certain days of the week." But trifling and absurd as is this doctrine, and although I was convinced from reason and from Scripture, "that every creature of God is good, and ought to be received with thanksgiving of them who believe and know the truth; yet while eating flesh on a Friday, or Saturday, a sudden thought of the possible criminality of my conduct, has darted on my mind, and convulsed my whole body, so that the knife and fork have fallen from my powerless hands on the table. This circumstance sometimes excited the laughter, but always awakened the pity, of the amiable Protestant family in which I resided.

"I have given you this, only as a specimen of the hold which their peculiar opinions have of the minds of Papists. Nor is it wonderful that these peculiar opinions should have such a hold of their minds. From the day on which they are first capable of forming a notion on any subject, they are impressed with the most awful ideas of their church, and all her doctrines and institutions. Their parents have been taught before them, and they are taught in their turn—that out of their church there is absolutely no salvation; and that to doubt or dispute any thing which she teaches, on any ground whatever, is most certainly to expose them to all the horrors of eternal perdition. In connection with these lessons, they are taught to hate and abhor all Protestants, of every class and description, and to hate and abhor every thing that is peculiar to them; but while they are taught these things, they are also taught to use every means in their power, without scruple (for the end sanctifies the means), to convert and bring them to the profession of their holy and infallible religion; and to induce them to engage in this work of conversion, they are assured that it is very acceptable to God, and very conducive to their own salvation.

"Such is the way in which I was taught from my infancy, and such is the way in which all the Papists with whom I was acquainted, taught their children. Of the influence which such a mode of teaching is fitted to have on the minds of youthful persons, you can be at no loss to judge. The impressions made on the mind in the nursery, are at no time, and in no circumstances, easily effaced; and I know that Popish parents make it their peculiar business, in every period of life, to strengthen and confirm the impressions which they have made on the minds of their children in religious matters.—It is to this mode of teaching that I ascribe several circumstances peculiarly characteristic of Papists. You are here, and indeed in the whole of this letter, to consider me as referring to Irish Papists, for it is with them that I am best ac-

quainted ; yet I presume the facts which I state are applicable to Papists in every country.

“ It is, I think, owing to the peculiar mode in which he is taught from his infancy, that a good staunch Papist, is one of the most credulous, and one of the most incredulous of human beings. Such a Papist firmly believes, that the Apostle Peter is the very rock on which Christ hath built his church ; he firmly believes that an ignorant and guilty creature, whom he calls a priest, can, by a few words, convert a piece of bread into the very God that made him—into the body and blood, the soul and divinity of Jesus Christ ; that every human being on the face of the earth, might each of them eat this God whole and entire, at the same instant of time, and that this might be done every day ; and he believes that the Virgin Mary, or any other saint in heaven, may hear a thousand millions of prayers, offered up at the same moment, from a thousand millions of different parts of the earth. A person capable of believing such things as these, one would think capable of believing any thing, which human language could be employed to express. But no such thing : the very person who will firmly believe all these monstrously absurd positions, will not believe a single word that is said against them. You may set before him the most clear and convincing arguments on these subjects from Scripture, from the dictates of reason, and from the testimony of his own senses ; but you will set them before him in vain. Nay, the more clear and convincing these arguments are, he will be the more averse to them, and the more unwilling to listen to you. Thus, while he is on the one side credulous to the last degree, he is on the other most incredulous. Is such a person one of those “ who receive not the love of the truth, that they might be saved, and to whom God sends strong delusion that they should believe a lie ? ”

As there is not room for another paragraph, I shall break off the narrative here, and resume it in my next Number. The writer is an entire stranger to me ; but he is well known to several gentlemen of this city, to whom he has given me a reference ; and such of them as I have had an opportunity of seeing, bear the most ample testimony to his character as a Christian, and his talents and usefulness as a minister of the gospel. He has kindly allowed me to give his name, which will appear in its proper place.

# Protestant,

No. XC.

---

SATURDAY, APRIL 1st, 1820.

---

*(Continued from No. LXXXIX.)*

“THE last word in the preceding paragraph recalls my attention to another circumstance peculiarly characteristic of Papists and which, in my view of the matter, springs from the manner in which they are taught. This circumstance is their proneness to dissimulation and falsehood, when they think they will promote the cause of their holy and infallible church. To do justice to this subject would require more time than I can at present spare ; and the light which you have already thrown on it, renders any thing like a full discussion of it by me, quite unnecessary. There are, however, two ways in which Papists manifest a proneness to dissimulation and falsehood, in favour of their church, on which, as far as I remember, you have not yet touched.—One of these ways is, by denying or maintaining certain doctrines, when they think that either the one or the other, will best serve their cause. There are two subjects on which they are, in this respect, dreadfully guilty. These are, “the power of the Priest to forgive sins,” and “the kind of worship which they pay, and ought to pay, to saints and images.” On these subjects, I have met Papists, who maintained directly opposite opinions ; and who maintained them at different times, with equal vigour and virulence. But take which side they please, they are at all times ready to quote scripture, and abuse Protestants for misrepresenting them. The other way in which Papists are guilty of dissimulation and falsehood, in favour of their holy and infallible church, is, by denying that they are Papists, and publicly professing themselves Protestants. This is a thing very often done. But I do not rest my charge, so much on the numbers who actually do this, as on those who approve of it where it is done. There is nothing among Papists more common, than to represent a large portion of the great, even the greatest, in our land, as like King Charles the Second, Catholics in heart, though Protestants by public profession ; and, instead of considering this a disgrace, they consider it one of the

great glories of their church. Nothing they think can confer higher honour on their cause, than for persons who have lived Protestants to die in their communion; and rather than lose such honours as these, they will invent and publish a thousand falsehoods. From what I have read of your work, Sir, I presume, you are too good a "Protestant" to envy Papists the honour of such persons dying in their communion. Persons whose last act on earth, is to proclaim their infamy, by publishing their hypocrisy, are surely such as "shall awake to shame and everlasting contempt;" such as "shall come forth to the resurrection of damnation." "How can these hypocrites—how can this generation of vipers, escape the damnation of hell?"

"Persons educated; and capable of acting in the manner now described, could not be uninterested spectators of the change I had made. Their conduct in reference to this change, is worthy of notice, as it strikingly indicates the spirit of Popery. As soon as the fact got abroad, the hue and cry was raised against me; and every effort was made to hunt me down. Motives, at once the most abominable and the most inconsistent with each other, were ascribed to me, and were employed to account for the atrocious and damnable part I had acted. Truth and decency, and every thing else, fitted to do honour to a religious profession, were readily sacrificed to render me odious, and to excite suspicion against me among Protestants. Nor did they in some cases labour in vain. There were among my acquaintances some Protestants, not unlike one to whom you have given some portion of celebrity, not very enviable. They were indeed Protestants; but this was owing to a mere circumstance; and that circumstance is, that their parents happened to be Protestants before them. This was all the reason they could give for their religious profession; and they did not hesitate to say "that no man ought to be trusted, who could change his religion." The number of such ignorant and inconsistent Protestants was but small; and instead of injuring, their conduct ultimately did me much good. It excited the sympathy and the kindness of many who might otherwise have taken little interest in my affairs. The friends whom God then raised up for me, have not since for a single moment forsaken me. I found them in August last, the same kind, warm-hearted, generous friends, I had found them 19 years before.

"But the efforts of Papists were not in my case, more than in the case of others, who had gone in the same way before me, to be confined to words. A John Huss and a Jerome of Prague could be reasoned with and abused; but if reasoning and abuse would not reclaim them from heresy, Papists could wield other weapons, and they did wield them. In suffering some personal violence for daring to think for myself, on the things that belong to

my peace, "no new thing happened to me." When arguments and calumny failed to bring me back to the mother church, some of her worthy sons endeavoured on two occasions, by blood and battery to convince me of the errors into which I had fallen. On both these occasions I had recourse to the law of the land for protection and punishment; and had no little reason to rejoice, that the laws were administered by Protestants. On one of these occasions, a severe fine was exacted, and considerable bail demanded and given, for the future good behaviour of the culprit, or I should rather say, "of the zealous, pious, and peaceable missionary of the holy and infallible church of Rome."

"Soon after this event, I came to Scotland; and must say that I found in it Papists as bigotted and as intolerant as I met with in Ireland. Of their bigotry and intolerance I could mention some facts; but they are unnecessary. They would at any rate be but as drops added to the ocean.

"When I reflect, Sir, on "the great things which God hath done for me, I should indeed be glad. My mouth should be filled with laughter, and my tongue with singing." I have been delivered from great darkness, and, I must add, from great danger. I will not say, That none within the pale of the church of Rome are saved, I would fondly hope that there are many within the pale of that church, who do not believe all, and trust in all, that is taught them, by their priests; but who chiefly take the oracles of God for their guide, and firmly trust in that atonement which is revealed in them, as the foundation of pardon and acceptance with God. Being Papists, however, much of the abominations of Popery must adhere to their opinions and practices; and before they can become partakers of eternal salvation, they must be purified from all these—and themselves "saved yet so as by fire." But, while charity leads me to hope this, I must declare that I could not hope it of one whose views of religion are similar to those I was taught, and which I entertained, when a Papist. Such views are most certainly subversive of the mediation of Christ; and render it of none effect to them who are under their influence. In such a state of things, then, I must have been lost! and lost for ever! How grateful ought I to be for the mighty and merciful deliverance I have experienced from such darkness and danger! O that I were enabled to walk worthy of it! "Bless the Lord, O my soul; and all that is within me, bless his holy name. Bless the Lord, O my soul; and forget not all his benefits: who forgiveth all thine iniquities; who healeth all thy diseases; who redeemeth thy life from destruction; who crowneth thee with loving kindness and tender mercies."

"With what is contained in the preceding pages, Sir, you are at liberty to do as you think proper; and if you think proper to

publish any part of them, you are at liberty to give or withhold my name as you please.—Of the truth of the facts contained in these pages, you need have no doubt. Many of them must, from their nature, depend upon my own authority; but for all those of a public kind, I can, if necessary, produce hundreds of witnesses, Popish and Protestant. “These things were not done in a corner.” Of my own character I forbear to say any thing, but, as I presume I am entirely unknown to you, I refer you to the following gentlemen in Glasgow; gentlemen with whom I have had the honour of being more or less intimate, for many years.—[Then follow the names of five clergymen, and several other gentlemen, of this city.]

“I am, Sir, yours truly,

“PATRICK BRADLEY.”

I return now to the subject of auricular confession, which will yet occupy several Numbers of my work.

According to the casuistry of the Jesuits, as given in their own words, in my 87th and 88th Numbers, it appears that the disciples of Loyola, and of course our English Papists, who approve the principles of that order, may break at pleasure any or all the divine commandments, and yet not be guilty of mortal sin. I inferred from this that confession of sin once a year to a priest must be a very trifling matter; and no more than a mere form, at least so far as regards transgressions of the law of God; for I admit that sins against any commandment of the church are not so easily passed over, or explained away, but must be atoned for by the most rigorous penance. He who shall commit the great sin of eating flesh on a Friday, or of going into a Protestant place of worship, or who shall fall short of paying any of his church dues, and who shall confess any of these faults to his priest, will be dealt with much more severely, than the man who has only blasphemed his Maker, or murdered his neighbour.

But though confession is thus made easy to the Jesuits, and all the truly initiated, it is a very dreadful thing to the simple faithful, who retain any traces of reverence for the law of God, and who are not instructed in the quibbling casuistry which makes it void. To come before a priest in order to make confession, is such a solemn and important step, that in order to do it properly, the penitent is recommended to spend several days in humiliation before God. Thus the Priest is the principal object of reverence, for the sinner must not approach him without preparation and humiliation, whereas he may come to his Maker at once.

In order to prove this, I shall insert here a whole chapter of instructions from Challoner's “Garden of the Soul,” one of their



most popular books of devotion ; a book that contains a great deal of matter which has the appearance of piety, but all directed to a wrong object. It is very much like what I should imagine to have been the devotion of the Babylonians, to Bell and Nebo, expressed in the language of Sion :—

“ INSTRUCTIONS AND DEVOTIONS FOR CONFESSION.—In order to prepare yourself to make a good confession, endeavour, in the first place, to recommend the matter earnestly to God ; and for some days before, and frequently and fervently, beg his divine grace and assistance : and this more especially, if you have for a long time lived in the habit of sin : in which case it is most proper to prepare yourself by a spiritual retreat of some days, during which time you may seriously enter into yourself, and perform the ten meditations (which we have transcribed above from *St. Francis de Sales*) or such like devotions, by which you may be sufficiently disposed for so great a work ; which otherwise 'tis to be feared might be ill done by being done too hastily.

“ Examine your conscience with care and diligence, yet without too much anxiety and scrupulosity. Consult the table of sins to help your memory ; and reflect in particular on the evil inclinations you are most subject to, on the places and companies you have been in, on your usual employments, on the duties of your calling, and how you have discharged them, &c. And in every sin, whether of commission or omission, strive to call to your remembrance the number of times you have been guilty.

“ When you have duly examined your conscience, dont think this is all you have to do in order to be rightly prepared for confession ; the greatest part of the work remains still to be done ; and that is, to take proper time and care to procure a hearty sorrow and detestation of all your sins, by which you have offended so good a God, with a full determination, with the grace of God, to avoid the like sins for the future, and to fly the occasions which usually bring you to sin ; and to take proper measures to begin a new life.

“ In order to obtain this hearty sorrow for your sins, and this firm purpose of amendment, you must earnestly beg it of God, whose gift it is ; and you must make use of such prayers, considerations and meditations as be most proper to move you to it. Particularly reflect on the four last things, on the enormity of sin, on the goodness of God, and his benefits to you, on the death and passion of Christ, &c. And when you have obtained this hearty sorrow and resolution, then you may hope that you are sufficiently prepared for confession, and not till then.

“ If you have any thing upon your conscience, which you have a particular difficulty of confessing, cease not with prayers and tears to importune your heavenly Father to assist you in

regard till he gives you grace to overcome that difficulty: And be sure never to go to confession with a design of telling a lie to the Holy Ghost. Ah! what a comfort it will be to you to ease your conscience of its load! and what a rack and torture sacrilegiously to conceal it!

“Let your confession be humble, without seeking excuses for your sins, or flinging the fault on others; let it be entire as to the kind and number of your sins, and such circumstances as quite change the nature of the sin, or notoriously aggravate it. Be modest in your expressions, and take care not to name any third person.”

Then follows “a prayer to implore the divine assistance, in order to make a good confession.” The prayer is a pretty long one, and the language is very like that of devotion. The following are extracts from it:—“I desire now to comply with thy holy institution of the sacrament of penance; I desire to confess my sins with all sincerity to thee and to thy minister; and therefore I desire to know myself, and to call myself to an account, by a diligent examination of my conscience. But, O my God, how miserably shall I deceive myself, if thou assist me not in this great work by thy heavenly light.” That is the *great work* of telling to a fellow creature the sins which he has committed against God; and although God alone be the party offended by his sins, he is taught to speak as if he were certain that God would take his part, and help him to make a proper appearance before his priest. This prayer concludes as follows:—“O blessed Virgin, mother of my Redeemer, mirror of innocence and sanctity, and refuge of penitent sinners, intercede for me through the passion of thy Son, that I may have the grace to make a good confession. All you blessed angels and saints of God, pray for me, a poor miserable sinner, that I may now, for good and all, turn from my evil ways, that so henceforth my heart may be forever united with yours in eternal love, and never go astray from the sovereign good. Amen.” The following note is appended:—“This, or the like prayer, may be frequently repeated for some days before confession, in order to obtain of God the grace of making a good confession.”

What is meant by a *good confession* is not so explicitly stated as I think it should be; but the phrase is a scriptural one; and perhaps it was chosen by the priests, and is by them so often repeated to make the thing go down more easily. They can tell us that Christ Jesus, before Pontius Pilate, witnessed a *good confession* (1 Tim. vi, 13.) and therefore every Christian ought to make a good confession to his priest. There is no connexion or correspondence between the things. Christ confessed what was both good and true; and thus he made a good confession but

the church of Rome has been pleased, in her infallible wisdom, to apply the expression to the confession of her penitents, though it should contain nothing but that which is evil; and the greater the evil confessed, so much the better is the confession.

I shall now give a specimen of the manner in which a penitent is taught to catechise himself, with a view to his being catechised by the priest, when he goes to confess. The "Garden of the Soul," furnishes, "An examination of conscience upon the ten commandments." I shall give only a few extracts as a sample. Some of the questions are not fit to meet the eye of a modest man or woman, and yet they have a conspicuous place in this favourite book of Popish devotion.

On the first commandment:—"Have you been guilty of heresy, or disbelief of any article of faith, or of voluntary doubting of any article of faith? How often? And for how long a time? Or have you rashly exposed yourself to the danger of infidelity, by reading bad books, or keeping wicked company? How often? Have you by word or deed denied your religion, or gone to the churches or meetings of heretics, so as to join with them any way in their worship? Or to give scandal? How often?" On the third commandment, (or what they call the second, for they omit in their catechisms what is properly the second,) such questions as these are asked:—"Have you sworn falsely, or what you did not certainly know, whether it was true or false? Or have you sworn to do any thing that was wicked or unlawful? Or broken your lawful oaths? How often? Have you had a custom of swearing rashly and inconsiderately by the name of God, by your soul, or by the way of imprecation upon yourself? How long have you had this custom? How many times a day have you sworn after this manner? Have you sworn by the blood or wounds of God, or any other blasphemous oath? How often? Have you cursed yourself or others, and if so, was it from your heart? How often?" &c. &c.

"Have you neglected to hear mass upon Sundays and holy-days of obligation? Or have you heard it with wilful distraction? Or not taken care that your children or servants should hear it? How often? Have you spent those days in idleness, or sin? Or been the occasion of others spending them so? How often? Have you done any servile work without necessity on those days? Or set others on doing so? How often? Have you broke the days of abstinence commanded by the church? or eaten more than one meal on fasting days? or been accessory to others so doing? How often? Have you neglected to confess your sins once a year? or to receive the blessed sacrament at Easter? Have you made a sacrilegious confession or communion,

by concealing some mortal sin in confession, or what you doubted might be mortal? Or for want of a hearty sorrow for your sins and a firm purpose of amendment? Or by being grossly negligent in the examination of your conscience? How often? Have you received any other sacrament, for example, confirmation or matrimony in mortal sin? Have you neglected to perform the penance enjoined in confession? Or said it with wilful distractions? How often? Have you presumed to receive the blessed sacrament after having broken your fast? Have you, after falling into mortal sin, neglected for a long time to return to God by repentance? And for how long a time?" I have here given the whole of what is to be inquired into relating to the divine command, "Thou shalt remember the Sabbath-day to keep it holy:" and the reader will see, that there is scarcely a word that relates to the spirit and meaning of the divine precept. The holy day of spiritual rest is quite forgotten; the fasts and feasts of the church are put in its place; and the sinner professing penitence, is taught to purge his conscience only with regard to the latter.

I shall not disgust my readers by taking them over the catechetical exercise upon the other commandments. The above is sufficient to shew what sort of a thing auricular confession is, so far as regards the things confessed upon the commandments of the first table. And here there is one thing which must, I think, deeply affect the reader's mind. The interrogatories are all formed upon the supposition that the penitent may be a great and habitual transgressor. He may be one who has had a custom of swearing rashly and inconsiderately by the name of God, by his soul, and by way of imprecation upon himself; and who has been in the habit of doing so many times in a day. Now in order to make "a good confession," it is not necessary that he have actually forsaken this wicked habit. It is enough that he confess his fault, and promise or *resolve* to forsake it; or make a *firm resolution* of forsaking it; and the priest, upon this *confession* and *resolution*, and *promise*, grants him absolution.

Now in this, as in every thing else, Popery appears directly opposed to the religion of the Bible. True Christianity knows nothing of good resolutions distinct from good practice. There is not in the whole Bible a promise of pardon to him who only resolves to forsake his sins. This, however, in ordinary cases, is as much as the priest expects from his kneeling suppliant.

## Protestant,

No. XCI.

---

 SATURDAY, APRIL 8th, 1820.
 

---

MY last number broke off in the middle of what I had written on the subject of good resolutions, with which, therefore, I commence the present.

In answer to the question, "What is required to a good confession?" the Douay catechism answers:—"1. That we seriously examine our consciences; 2. Be heartily sorry for our sins, with a *firm purpose to amend*, taking time and care to make an act of contrition," &c. And, "What is a firm purpose of amendment? Ans. It is a *resolution*, by the grace of God, not only to avoid sin, but also the occasion of it." And the "Papist truly Represented," teaches, that whosoever comes to the priests, "making a sincere and humble confession of his sins, with a true repentance, and a *firm purpose of amendment*, and a hearty *resolution of turning from his evil ways*, may from them receive absolution," &c. This is the current language of all their catechisms and books of devotion which I have seen. All their promises of pardon are given to hearty repentance and good resolutions. If it were the repentance which springs from faith in Jesus Christ, I would not object to connecting with it a promise of pardon; but such repentance is inseparably connected with actually forsaking sin, not with a mere *resolution* to forsake it. The hearty repentance of the Papist is that into which he works himself by fasting and flagellation; and while suffering or expecting to suffer such things, it is very natural to *resolve* to forsake sin, and even to make a *firm purpose* to forsake it some time or other. Now, when a man comes to a priest, and makes such professions, the priest must grant him absolution, and declare him reconciled to God, having all his sins forgiven, though both priest and penitent be unpersuaded of any change in the character of the latter, and though both expect he will immediately return to the practice of all manner of wickedness, trusting to the efficacy of a new confession, and a new absolution.

The "Garden of the Soul" furnishes a preparatory exercise

for confession, in which actual amendment is not required as necessary to a good confession. The penitent is instructed, not to forsake his sins, or amend his life, but only to think of the measures which he must take for an entire amendment; and to be fully determined, for the time to come, to amend his life. These instructions relate to confession every time that a man makes it; and though he should have confessed annually fifty times, his exercise in his fiftieth year of confession embraces only a purpose of amendment,—a purpose that will never be carried into effect, unless the sinner shall renounce Popery, and embrace the gospel of Christ. Without this, he will but “resolve, and re-resolve, and die the same.”

When a penitent has spent several days in deep humiliation before God, he may then venture, but very cautiously, to approach, and confess his sins to a priest. The following is part of the preparatory exercise recommended in the above-mentioned work, in order that a penitent may, in a proper spirit, prostrate himself in the awful presence of his ghostly father.

“*N. B.* Here it is proper that the penitent should think upon the measures he must take for an entire amendment of life for the time to come; considering well what have been the occasions of his sins; what circumstances are apt to be dangerous to him; what precautions he must take against those dangers for the future; what pious exhortations he must daily make use of; such as prayer, meditation, spiritual reading, &c. When, and how, often, frequent the sacrament, &c. When the penitent finds himself heartily sorry for having offended God, and fully determined for the time to come to amend his life, and avoid all *mortal* sins, and the immediate occasions of them; he may then go to confession, in which he may follow this method.

“**THE METHOD OF CONFESSION.** The penitent, kneeling down at the side of his ghostly father, makes the sign of the cross, and asks his blessing: Pray father, give me your blessing, for I have sinned. Then he says the Confiteor in Latin, or in English, as far as *mea culpa*, &c. through my fault, &c.—2. After this he accuses himself of his sins, either according to the order of God’s commandments, or such other order as he finds most helpful to his memory; adding, after each sin, the number of times he has been guilty of it, and such circumstances as may very considerably aggravate the guilt; but carefully abstaining from such as are impertinent or unnecessary, and from excuses and long narrations.—3. After he has confessed all that he can remember, he may conclude with this or the like form: ‘For these, and all my other sins, which I cannot at present call to my remembrance, I am heartily sorry; purpose amendment for the future; most humbly ask pardon of God, and penance and absolution from you my

ghostly father :’ and so he may finish the Confiteor (or confession,) and then give attentive ear to the instructions and advices of his confessor, and humbly accept of the penance enjoined by him. 4. Whilst the priest gives him absolution, let him bow down his head, and with great humility call upon God for mercy ; and beg of him that he would be pleased to pronounce the sentence of absolution in heaven, whilst his minister absolves him on earth.—5. After confession, let the penitent return to his prayers ; and after having heartily given God thanks for having admitted him, by the means of this sacrament, to the grace of reconciliation, and received him like the prodigal child, returning home, let him make an offering of his confession to Jesus Christ, begging pardon for whatever defects he may have been guilty of in it, offering up his *resolutions* to his Saviour, and begging grace that he may put them in execution.—6. Let him be careful to perform his penance in due time, and in a penitential spirit.”

Then follows a prayer to be said after confession, in which the penitent gives thanks for being admitted to this “ sacrament of reconciliation.” He speaks as if he were perfectly certain that all his sins are forgiven. He *resolves* henceforward to flee occasions of sin. He *resolves* to perform such good devotions as are necessary for obtaining this grace ; and he *resolves* to fly idleness, and to set himself a regular order and method of life, for the time he has yet to come. Thus the poor devotee of a false religion is taught to deceive himself, and to say to his soul peace, peace, when there is no peace. He is taught to believe that, in virtue of his confession and the priest’s absolution, he is perfectly reconciled to God, while all the affections of his heart are as much estranged from God as ever. He is, therefore, in a worse, and more dangerous condition, than the transgressor who never professed to repent of his sins ; for while the latter may be open to conviction, and accessible to the remedy which the gospel reveals, the former has his heart shut against every application. He who is whole, or who thinks himself whole, will not apply to the physician.

There is no truth more certain, and none more important to the human race than this—there is forgiveness with God. This is a matter of pure revelation ; for unless God himself had made it known, no sinner would ever have found it out ; and without the knowledge of this truth, no sinner would ever have repented or returned to God. We see what is the natural tendency of sin in the conduct of our first parents, who, when they became sinners, instead of seeking, or returning to God, made a silly attempt to flee from him. Adam confessed plainly that he was afraid to meet his Creator ; that was because he considered him as now his enemy. He had indeed become an enemy of God ; he very naturally concluded that God was his enemy ; and from all that he knew at

the time, he could not possibly think otherwise. He had incurred the dreadful sentence of condemnation ; and as yet there was no revelation of mercy.

But looking with infinite compassion upon a ruined world, God did that very day make himself known in that gracious character in which he has been acknowledged and worshipped by his church in all ages. This character is expressed by himself in one short sentence—"A just God and a Saviour ;"—just, in inflicting the punishment of transgression upon a willing substitute ; and a Saviour, as, by this medium, he extends pardon and salvation to the guilty. This was revealed to our first parents, as recorded in the third chapter of Genesis, in language which would appear extremely obscure to us, if we had never been told any more about it ; but it is made perfectly plain by subsequent revelations contained in the Bible ; and there can be no doubt that it was also made plain to Adam and Eve by the institution of sacrifice, which directed them to the promised seed of the woman, who should, at the appointed time, reconcile sinners to God by the sacrifice of himself. Those who believed the promise, came directly to God, confessing their sins over the head of the slain sacrifice, and they received pardon in virtue of the atonement of Christ, which such sacrifice represented.

We have nothing distinctly recorded of the faith of the two first transgressors ; but we have a very explicit statement with regard to that of their second son, Gen. iv. 4. and Heb. xi. 4. He understood and embraced the promise for his own salvation ; and offered to God an acceptable sacrifice. In slaying the victim, he acknowledged that he deserved to die for his sins. He came to God as a sinner deserving to perish ; but imploring mercy in the name, and for the sake of the promised Saviour, he was pardoned, and saved. There never was a sin pardoned, or a sinner saved, in any other way ; and never did a sinner perish who came to God as Abel did.

Thus to the first sinners of mankind God made himself known in his holy and gracious character, as the God of mercy, forgiving the greatest transgressors, upon the footing of a propitiatory sacrifice. Now it was God in this very character that men did not like to retain in their knowledge. Rom. i. 28. The object of their aversion was, "that which may be known of God," which was "manifest to them ; for God had showed, (or revealed) it unto them." verse 19. It was therefore not so much God as Creator of all things, as God in his revealed character, whom, when men knew, "they glorified not as God, neither were thankful." It is true that from the very creation of the world, God made known his eternal power and Godhead, not only by direct revelation, but also by visible exhibitions of that power in the things which



were made, so as to leave men "without excuse," when they disbelieved his promise of a Saviour to come. When sinners questioned his power or his wisdom to effect their salvation, by the means which he had been pleased to reveal, he referred them to the earth and the heavens which his hands had made, as a standing evidence of what he was able to do, so that men had no "excuse" for their unbelief. This at least was the manner in which he expostulated with the desponding Jews, Isa. l. 2, 3. "Is my hand shortened at all that it cannot redeem? Or have I no power to deliver? Behold, at my rebuke I dry up the sea, and make the rivers a wilderness.—I clothe the heavens with blackness, and make sackcloth their covering."

Far be it from God to make a display of his power for the mere sake of display: when, therefore, he did, by the things which are made, make men understand his eternal power and Godhead, it was to encourage them to confide in his promise of an Almighty Saviour who should put away sin. Why are such magnificent descriptions of the power of God given in the fortieth chapter of Isaiah? Why, for instance, these bold interrogations, implying a declaration that all the things mentioned belong to God, and to him alone? "Who hath measured the waters in the hollow of his hand, and meted out heaven with the span, and comprehended the dust of the earth in a measure, and weighed the mountains in scales, and the hills in a balance?"—"Have ye not known? have ye not heard? *hath it not been told you from the beginning? have ye not understood from the foundations of the earth?* It is he that sitteth upon the circle of the earth, and the inhabitants thereof are as grasshoppers; that stretcheth out the heavens as a curtain, and spreadeth them out as a tent to dwell in." All this seems to be for the gracious purpose of confirming the faith of his people in the Saviour, whose coming is announced in the beginning of the chapter, and to encourage sinners to confide in him, seeing he whose power is thus described cannot fail in the accomplishment of his promise. Why faint or be discouraged? Why be afraid that the promise will fail? "The Creator of the ends of the earth fainteth not, neither is weary."

From the words of the Apostle, taken in connexion with those of the Prophet, it appears, I think, pretty plainly, that from the beginning or from the creation of the world, or from the foundations of the earth, which are all expressions of the same import, God revealed to men the things that might be known of him; that is, "the invisible things of him," things that could not be seen with the bodily eye; namely, his grace reigning through righteousness unto the eternal salvation of sinners through Jesus Christ; and at the very beginning of the world, when the fulfilment of his promise was very remote, he gave such a discovery or understanding of his power

and Godhead, as exhibited in his works, as to render inexcusable every man who would not believe his promise, and accept the salvation thus provided.

But this manifestation of the divine character was what men did not like; they did not like to retain it in their knowledge, and therefore they soon lost sight of it. So far as external revelation could go, the thing was as manifest to Cain as to Abel; but Cain did not like it. His quarrel was not with the divine perfection of power, or of wisdom, or any thing that could be known of God by his works. It was with his revealed character—it was with his spotless holiness and inflexible justice, that would not admit *him* into his presence, or accept an offering at his hands without a sacrifice of atonement. God had provided a Saviour for the guilty; but in order to be saved, men must come to him *as guilty*, confessing their sins, and crying for mercy. This is what Cain and his wicked descendants and imitators did not like. Therefore God gave them over to a reprobate mind, and to vile affections; they became vain in their imaginations, and their foolish hearts were darkened. This was the origin of all the idolatry and superstition that have been in the world.

There is, however, something in the hearts and consciences of men that will not let them rest without a religion. There is a consciousness of guilt, and an apprehension of punishment. The conscience must be pacified. God's way of doing so was very plainly revealed; but they did not like it, because it humbled their pride, and required them to forsake their sins. It then became the business of the more cunning of the descendants of Adam to invent something that should be in some respects like God's way of giving peace to the conscience; but yet so different from it as to allow men to continue in their sins. This was effected by idolatrous priests in various ways; but the system was never so completely organized, nor the plan of deceiving sinners so deplorably successful, as it has been in the church of Rome, under the name of Christianity.

The divinely appointed way of obtaining peace to the conscience, and the pardon of sin, is that of believing in the Lord Jesus Christ. On this subject, the testimony of Christ and of his Apostles is as plain as language can make it. "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have everlasting life." John iii. 16. "What shall I do to be saved?" said the alarmed, and almost despairing jailor of Philippi.—"Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved," was the Apostle's reply, Acts xvi. 31. The truth concerning Christ, when believed, establishes its residence in the heart; and by the power of the Holy Spirit, it effectually turns sinners from their evil ways. It is

by the incorruptible seed of the word ; that is, the Gospel,—the word of truth, which liveth and abideth for ever, that men are born again. The believer is born of water and of the Spirit ; he is made a new creature. He now sees sin in such a light as he never did before. He is taught to hate it with a perfect hatred. He perceives its impurity and horrible malignity in the evangelical testimony of what Christ suffered on account of it ; and for his own sins he humbles himself before God, in deep and unfeigned repentance. His repentance is not the effect of abstinence, or bodily mortification of any kind ; but the effect of the operation of the Holy Spirit, by means of the word of truth ; and where it exists there is not a mere purpose of amendment, or resolution to lead a new life. The heart is actually turned from sin unto holiness. The new life has begun ; and the love of Christ effectually produces in the repenting sinner a life of holy obedience.

But such a one will never forget that he is a sinner. Therefore he is in the daily practice of confessing his sins to God, and of begging forgiveness in the name of Jesus Christ. He knows that the blood of Christ cleanseth from all sin. He knows that he has continual access to this ; and having recourse to it every day by faith and prayer, he lives in the comfortable persuasion that his sins are forgiven. He has peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ. It is a peace, however, which is inseparably connected with continuing in the faith, and persevering in holy practice. It is absolutely inconsistent with indulgence in the least known sin ; and it knows nothing of the distinction of sins mortal and sins only venial.

One who is thus taught of God, confesses his sins to God alone, because he knows that he only is able to forgive. To think of another who could pardon or absolve him from his sins, would be the same thing as to think of another God. This was the feeling of the prophet Micah on this subject, chap. vii. 28. "Who is a God like unto thee, that pardoneth iniquity,"—and who "delighteth in mercy?" The interrogative form of the expression is well understood to be a strong asseveration that there is no other God that can do this.

Attend now to the manner in which Popery affects to impart the same benefits of pardon of sin and peace with God.

This she professes to effect by means of certain things which she calls sacraments, some of which are confessedly founded on divine institution, and others are of mere human invention. Of the former sort is baptism. This, though a divine ordinance, is divested of every thing that is divine in the hands of a Popish priest. It was meant as a sign of regeneration, as a representation of the work of the Holy Spirit, in renewing and sanctifying the soul ; but the church of Rome ascribes to baptism itself the power of regenerating. This is putting it out of its place, and

putting it in the place of the Holy Ghost ; just as the sacrifice of the mass is 'put in the place of the atonement of Christ. The church of Rome admits the doctrine of original sin ; but then she asserts that baptism takes it all away, and he who has just been baptized is as free from sin as an angel of God. In this way she gives peace to the consciences of her children ; but it is a peace that is founded on a falsehood, and which must issue in the ruin of all that believe it. Independently of its opposition to the divinely appointed way of giving peace to the conscience, the Popish method contains in itself that which must ever render it insecure. The whole virtue of the sacrament depends upon the good intention of the Priest : No man can be sure that the Priest had such intention when he baptized him ; and, therefore, upon their own principles, Papists can never be sure that they are regenerated. Mr. Gavin relates a story of a priest whom he knew, who, when dying, made this *good confession* that a great many people in his parish were not baptized, because he had performed the rite to them, when children, without the intention ; and moreover, he told his confessor, that all those stood in this predicament whose names were marked with a cross in the parish register. After his death the circumstance was mentioned to the Bishop, who ordered the book into his presence, and he found a number of names crossed. Such as were alive he sent for, and baptized privately ; but many were dead. These of course had perished for want of a good intention in their priest ; and every Papist now alive may be in danger of the same thing, for any thing that he knows ; for how can he be sure of the intention of the priest who baptized him ?

It cannot be shewn that the external rite of baptism ever made a man more holy than he was before. If the thing signified accompany the sign, a holy character is undoubtedly imparted ; but the experience of many centuries has proved that this is not always the case ; for we find that persons who have been baptized are, on growing up, just as unholy as those who have not. This, however, is a matter which does not give the church of Rome any concern, for she has in reserve the sacrament of confession and penance, by which she can take away all the sins which a man has committed after baptism. In the preceding pages, I think, I have clearly proved that this is the doctrine of the church of Rome. Persons may live in the practice of every vice ; yet by confessing to a priest as often as they please, they can get all their sins forgiven ; and it is required that they do this at least once a-year ; and once a-year they receive absolution, which absolution by a priest is understood to be as effectual, and it satisfies the sinner as completely, as if he were favoured by a voice from heaven assuring him that he was absolved in the court above.

THE  
**Protestant,**

No. XCII.

---

*SATURDAY, APRIL 15th, 1820.*

---

**W**HILE auricular confession is, to say the least of it, useless to him that makes it, it must be extremely pernicious to him who hears it. The mind of a Popish priest must be the common receptacle of all the filth in his parish. There is, as the word of God assures us, a desperate wickedness in the heart of man. The Almighty challenges for himself, exclusively, the knowledge of its deep depravity; and to him alone is it lawful for a sinner to lay open, in the way of confession, or contrite acknowledgment, all the wickedness which he feels within him. This can be done with safety only to him who, being infinitely holy, is incapable of pollution. To tell all the evil that is in one's heart to a fellow creature would corrupt the most innocent, and increase the wickedness of the most wicked. This, however, is what every Popish priest exacts of all his flock, without exception; and thus, by becoming familiar with the depravity of others, his own depravity must be fearfully augmented. Nay, he becomes so hardened in wickedness as to be the corrupter of the young and comparatively innocent. He insinuates the poison of his own filthy imagination into the hearts of the inexperienced, and effects their seduction under the pretext of promoting their salvation.

That this is not an exaggerated statement, I could easily prove, with disgusting minuteness, from a variety of authorities, which all confirm the testimony of Mr. Bradley, in my 89th Number, page 306. In particular, I have before me the narrative of John Gordon, a native of Aberdeenshire, who, against his will, was sent to a Popish seminary, in the Highlands, and afterwards to the Scotch College in Paris, in order to be educated for the priesthood. Having no means of escape, for a long time, he was obliged to conform to all the rules of the College. At last, however, he happily effected his escape, and returning to Scotland, he renounced Popery, and embraced the Protestant religion, before the Presby-

tery of Edinburgh, on the 7th of June, 1731. A certificate to that effect is prefixed to his work, signed by Jo. Guthrie, Moderator. Soon after his arrival in Paris, he was obliged to go to confession, and to go through all the preparatory exercises, which he relates very minutely. Then, speaking of the confession itself, which he was instructed to make, he says,—“ But all this was to be understood of *mortal* sins, or those that kill the soul, at one blow ; but as for venial sins, we could obtain remission of them without confession, by saying a *Paternoster*, an *Ave Maria*, or the like. However, as for young people, such as we, who had but just come out of the contagious sea of the world, it was our safest way, he told us, to declare or confess all, because we could not, so well as our confessors, discern between mortal and venial sins.

“ After this we were sent to our chambers, to begin an examination of our consciences. Paper, pen, and ink, were given us, that we might write down all the sins we could think of. When they had given us sufficient time for examination, then they gave us some prayers to say, for obtaining contrition, or sorrow, for our sins ; after which Mr. Smith was placed in the confessional, to hear our several accounts. I must confess these proceedings did not well digest with me ; but I was too well secured either to make off, or disobey ; so to the confessional I went, where, I must own, there was not a corner of my conscience but what was pretty well sifted by the *impertinent interrogations* he made, by which *I learned more sins than ever I had heard of, when conversant in the world.* However, I came pretty well off ; for the only penance I had imposed on me was to repeat, every day, for the space of two weeks, the seven psalms which are called penitential psalms ; and because I had apostatized from them, as he said, he ordered me for that to sleep in my clothes, for the abovementioned time. That was the *peccatum contra Spiritum Sanctum* (sin against the Holy Ghost) against which he spake for a considerable time. However, out of compassion, he lifted up his hands, and gave me absolution.”

After a variety of interesting matter, Mr. Gordon proceeds :—  
“ But to return to the rest of my adventures in France—Having finished my course of divinity, I was obliged to take the order of a sub-deacon, and a year after, I was made a deacon. I was then most of all shocked ; for now I was obliged to do what I detested to see others perform. There was a breviary put in my hands, which every day I must say under pain of mortal sin, in which there was such an account of saints, and offices to their honour, that it was nauseous to rehearse them. Every Saturday we were obliged to say the Office of the Virgin Mary, and litanies to her honour, where there were such bombast titles, as, *Stella Maris*,

Star of the Sea ; *Rosea Mystica*, Mystical Rose ; *Turris Davidica*, Tower of David ; *Turris Eburnea*, Tower of Ivory, and the like ; and *Ora pro nobis* (Pray for us), at the end of each of these titles. It was also incumbent on me to exercise the functions of the orders I received, viz. to carry crosses at their processions, and the holy water, and to offer incense to their sacrament, altars, and pictures ; to carry their sacrament about the churches, and from their tabernacles to their altar ; during which time every person prostrated himself on the ground, and adored it. These, and such like practices, made me very uneasy ; but I did not know how to avoid them.

“ Being now thus advanced, I was obliged to be more conversant in the world than formerly, and very soon became acquainted with several confessors, in particular with one Mr. Holdar, *alias* Jonathan Holdforth, in the English seminary of Paris, who was confessor to most of the English nuns, in the monastery of Sion, by St. Victor’s. All our conversation ran upon the different stories he heard in confession, and of the nuns’ scruples of conscience,” &c. &c. “ that I am ashamed to rehearse them. So that I would advise these ladies either to forbear frequenting confession, or at least to make choice of a discreet person. But he is not the only person who is free in revealing what he has heard ; for it is the ordinary discourse of the priests, when they meet, to inform one another of what they have heard in confession, and how dexterously they behaved on these occasions. This I can assert, because I was often present at such conferences, where the conversation was so indecent that even an honest Pagan would have blushed.” pp. 61, 62. This work is dedicated to the celebrated Duncan Forbes, of Culloden, with whom the author seems to have been acquainted ; and I see no reason to question the truth of any of his statements. Indeed, independently of such facts as are narrated, it must be evident to every person acquainted with human nature, that confession, as practised in the church of Rome, must have a direct tendency to deprave the morals of the priests themselves, as well as of their miserable dupes.

Mr. Gavin, in his “ Master Key,” gives a most minute illustration of this subject, with several examples of the mischievous effect of auricular confession, in debauching the minds of young persons. “ To the discovery of mortal sins,” says he, “ the father confessor doth very much help the penitent ; for he sometimes out of pure zeal, but most commonly out of curiosity, asks them many questions to know whether they do remember all their sins, or not ? By these, and the like questions, the confessors do more harm than good, especially to the ignorant people and young women.” “ And when they come to that tribunal, with a sincere, ignorant heart, to receive advice and instruction, they go home with light,

knowledge, and an idea of sins unknown to them before." *Vol. 1. p. 5.*

After a variety of preparatory ceremonies, which are particularly described, the penitent "riseth and goes to the confessional; that is, the confessing place, where the confessor sits in a chair like our hackney chairs, which is most commonly placed in some of the chapels, and in the darkest place of the church. The chairs, generally speaking, have an iron grate at each side, but none at all before; and some days of devotion, or on a great festival, there is such a crowd of people, that you may see three penitents at once about the chair, one at each grate, and the other at the door, though only one confessing at a time, whispering in the confessor's ear, that the others should not hear what he says; and when he has done, another begins, and so on. But most commonly they confess at the door of the chair one after another; for thus the confessor has opportunity of knowing the penitent: and though many gentlewomen, either out of bashfulness, or shame, or modesty, do endeavour to hide their faces with a fan or veil, notwithstanding all this, they are known by the confessor, who, if curious, by crafty questions, brings them to tell their names and houses, and this in the very act of confession; or else he examines their faces when the confession is over, whilst the penitents are kissing his hand or sleeve; and if he cannot know them this way, he goes himself to give the sacrament, and then every one being obliged to show his face, is known by the curious confessor, who doth this not without a private view and design, as will appear at the end of some private confessions."

Then comes the *Confiteor*, which is, in English, as follows:—"I do confess to God Almighty, to the blessed Mary, always a virgin, to the blessed Archangel, Michael, to the blessed John Baptist, to the holy Apostles Peter and Paul, to all the saints, and to thee O father, that I have too much sinned by thought, word, and deed, by my fault, *by my fault*, by my greatest fault: Therefore I beseech the blessed Mary, always a virgin, the blessed Archangel, Michael, the blessed John Baptist, the holy Apostles, Peter and Paul, and all the saints, and thee, O father—to pray God our Lord for me, *Amen*." "This done, the penitent raises himself from his prostration to his knees, and touching with his lips either the ear or the cheek of the spiritual father, begins to discover his sins by the ten commandments."

Surely it is not necessary to make any comment on this compound of idolatry and absurdity. The whole process is so horribly revolting to every feeling of decency and common sense, that it is with difficulty I have brought myself to write it. One can scarcely think of the labial application to the ear or the cheek of the priest as above enjoined, without remembering the in- on



of the idolatrous priests to the children of Israel, "Let the men that sacrifice *kiss the calves*." Hosea xiii. 2.

Mr. Gavin gives about half a dozen examples of confession made by nuns and others, which I must be excused from inserting in my work; and then he proceeds to show how the priests accommodate themselves to persons and circumstances, so as to be very lenient to some, and rigorous to others, just as they think lenity or rigour will best serve their purpose.

"If a poor countryman," says he, "goes to confess, the father confessor takes little pains with him; for, as he expects little or nothing from him, he heareth him, and, with bitter words, corrects the poor man, and, most commonly without any correction, imposing upon him a hard penance, sends him away with the same ignorance he went with to confess.

"If a soldier happens to go to make his peace with God (so they express themselves, when they go to confession), then the confessor sheweth the power of a spiritual guide. He questions him about three sins only; *to wit*, thefts, drunkenness, and uncleanness. Perhaps the poor soldier is free from the two first; but if he is guilty of the last, the confessor draws the consequence that he is guilty of all the three, and terrifying him with hell, and all the devils, and the fire of it, he chargeth him with restitution, and that he is obliged to pay so much money for the relief of the souls in purgatory, or else he cannot get absolution. So the poor man, out of better conscience than his confessor, offers a month's pay, which must be given upon the spot (for, in the shop of confessors, there is neither trust nor credit) to appease the rough, bitter confessor, and to get absolution; and I believe this hard way of using the poor soldiers, is the reason that they do not care at all for that act of devotion; and as they are so bad customers to the confessors' shop, the confessors use their endeavours, when they come to buy absolution, to sell it as dear as they can; so, at one time, they pay for two, three, or more years.

"I have heard a soldier, cursing the confessors, say—'If I continue in the king's service twenty years, I will not go to confess; for it is easier and cheaper to lift up my finger and be absolved by our chaplain, than to go to a friar who doth nothing but rail and grumble at me, and yet I must give him money for masses, or else he will not absolve me.'"

Lifting up the finger is thus explained in a note:—"The custom of the Spanish army, in the field, and the day before the battle or before the engagement, is, that the chaplain goes through all the companies, to ask the officers whether they have a mind to confess, and if one has any thing to say, he whispers in the chaplain's ear, and so through all the officers. As for the private men;—crying out, he says, 'he that has a sin, let him lift up one finger,' and then he gives a general absolution to all at once."

“ If a collegian goes to confess, he finds a mild and sweet confessor ; and, without being questioned, and with a small penance, he generally gets absolution. The reason the confessors have to use the collegians with great civility and mildness is, first, because, if a collegian is ill used by his confessor, he goes to a deaf friar, who absolves *ad dextram et ad sinistram* all sorts of penitents, for a rial of plate ; and after, he (the collegian) inquireth and examineth into all the other confessor’s actions, visits, and intrigues ; and when he has got matter enough, he will write a lampoon on him, which has happened very often in my time. So the confessor dares not meddle with the collegians, for fear that his tricks should be brought to light ; and another reason is, because the collegians, for the generality, are like the *filles de joye*, in Lent ; that is, without money, and so the confessor cannot expect any profit by them.

“ I say, if absolution be denied to a collegian, he goes to a deaf confessor ; for some confessors are called deaf, not because they are really deaf, but because they give small penance, without correction ; and never deny absolution, though the sins be referred to the Pope. I knew two Dominican friars, who were known by the name of deaf confessors, because they never used to question the penitent.

“ One of such confessors has more business in Lent, than twenty of the others.”—“ All the great and habitual sinners go to the deaf confessor, who gives upon the bargain, a certificate, in which he says, that such a one has fulfilled the commandment of the church ; for everybody is obliged to produce a certificate of confession to the minister of the parish, before Easter, or else he must be exposed in the church. So, as it is a hard thing for an old sinner to get absolution, and a certificate from other covetous confessors, without a great deal of money, they generally go to the deaf confessors. I had a friend in the same convent, who told me that such confessors were obliged to give two-thirds of their profit to the community ; and there being only two deaf confessors in that convent, he assured me that, in one Lent, they gave to the Father Prior six hundred pistoles apiece.”

“ If a modest, serious, religious lady comes to confession, he uses her in another way ; for he knows that such ladies never come to confess, without giving a good charity for masses ; so all the confessor’s care is, to get himself into the lady’s favour, which he doth by hypocritical professions of goodness and devotion, of humility and strictness of life. He speaks gravely and conscientiously, and, if the lady has a family, he gives her excellent advices, as, to keep her children within the limits of sobriety and virtue, for the world is so deceitful, that we ought always to be upon our guard ; and to watch continually over our souls, &c. And by that means, and the like (the good lady believing him to be a sin-

cere and devout man), he becomes the guide of her soul, of her house and family; and most commonly the ruin of her children, and sometimes her own ruin too. I will give the following instance, to confirm this truth; and as the thing was public, I need not scruple to mention it, with the real names:—In the year 1706, F. Antonia Gallardo, Augustin friar, murdered Donna Isabella Mendez, and a child three weeks old, sucking at her breast. The lady was but twenty-four years of age, and had been married eight years to Don Francisco Mendez. The friar had been her spiritual guide, for all that while, and all the family had so great a respect and esteem for him, that he was the absolute master of the house. The lady was brought to bed, and Don Francisco being obliged to go into the country, for four days, desired the father to come and be in his house, and take care of it, in his absence. The father's room was always ready; so he went there the same day Don Francisco went into the country. At eight, at night, both the father and the lady went to supper, and after he had sent away all the maids and servants into the hall to sup, the lady took the child to give him suck; and the friar told her, in plain and short reasons, his love, and that without any delay or reply, she must comply with his request. The lady said to him,—‘Father, if you propose such a thing to try my faithfulness and virtue, you know my conscience these eight years past; and if you have any ill design, I will call my family, to prevent your further assurance.’ The friar then, in fury, taking a knife, killed the child, and wounded so deeply the mother, that she died two hours after. The friar made his escape; but whether he went to his convent or not, we did not hear. I myself saw the lady dead, and went to her burial, in the church of the old St. John.”

I come now to show that notwithstanding the solemnity and importance of auricular confession in the Church of Rome, it is sometimes reduced to a mere farce, for the amusement of a parish. “The preacher of the parish pitcheth upon one day of the week, most commonly in the middle of Lent, to hear the children’s confessions; and gives notice to the congregation, the Sunday before, that every father of a family may send his children, both boys and girls, to church, on the day appointed, in the afternoon. The mothers dress their children the best way they can, that day, and give them the offering money, for the expiation of their sins. That afternoon is a holiday in the parish, not by precept but by custom; for no parishioner, either old or young, man or woman, misseth to go and hear the children’s confessions. For it is reckoned among them a greater diversion than a comedy, as you may judge by the following account:—

“The day appointed, the children repair to church, at three or the clock, where the preacher is waiting for them, with a long reed

in his hand ; and when all are together, the reverend father placeth them in a circle round himself, and then kneeling down, the children also doing the same, makes the sign of the cross, and says a short prayer. This done, he exhorteth the children to hide no sin from him, but to tell him all they have committed. Then he strikes with the reed the child whom he designs to confess the first, and asks him the following questions. *Confessor.* How long is it since you last confessed? *Boy.* Father, a whole year, or the last Lent. *Conf.* And how many sins have you committed, from that time till now? *Boy.* Two dozen. Now the Confessor asks round :—And you? *Boy.* A thousand and ten. Another will say, a bag-full of small lies, and ten big sins ; and so one after another answers, and tells many childish things. *Conf.* But pray, you say you have committed ten big sins, tell me, how big? *Boy.* As big as a tree. *Conf.* But tell me the sins. *Boy.* There is one sin I committed, which I dare not tell your reverence before all the people ; for somebody here present will kill me, if he heareth it. *Conf.* Well, come out of the circle and tell it me. Then both go out, and with a loud voice, he tells him, that such a day he stole a nest of sparrows from a tree, of another boy's, and that if he knew it, he would kill him. Then both come again into the circle, and the father asks other boys and girls so many ridiculous questions, and the children answer him so many pleasant, innocent things, that the congregation laughs all the while. One will say that his sins are red ; another, that one of his sins is white, one black, and one green ; and in these trifling questions they spend two hours. When the congregation is weary of laughing, the confessor gives the children a correction, and bids them not to sin any more, for a black boy takes along with him the wicked children. Then he asks the offering, and after he has got all from them, he gives them the penance for their sins. To one he says, I give you for penance to eat a sweet cake ; to another, to go to school the day following ; to another, to desire his mother to buy him a new hat ; and such things as these : and pronouncing the words of absolution, he dismisseth the congregation with *Amen*, So be it, every year.

“ From seven to fifteen, there is no extraordinary thing to say to young people, only that from seven years of age, they begin to confess in private, and receive the sacrament in public. The confessors have very little trouble with such young people, and likewise little profit, except with a *puella*, who sometimes begins, at twelve years, the course of a lewd life, and then the confessor finds business and profit enough, when she comes to confess. See *Master Key to Popery*, vol. 1st, part 1st.

THE  
**Protestant,**

No. XCIII.

---

SATURDAY, APRIL 22d, 1820.

---

**THE** sacrament of confession, as it is called, as administered by a parcel of idle and luxurious ecclesiastics, must be productive of the most enormous wickedness. This might be inferred from the nature of the sacrament, and the well known character of those who administer it; but there are abundance of facts adduced by various authors, which completely prove that the lewdness of heathen idolatry is outdone by that of Popery, under this single rite. It is difficult to write with decency on such a subject; but it is necessary to tell at least part of the truth, in justice to the cause in which I am engaged, that is, to expose the church of Rome as the very Antichrist that is opposed to all that is holy, and just, and good.

Da Costa, a Portuguese gentleman, a member of the church of Rome, in his relation of what he suffered in the Inquisition, in consequence of being accused of Free Masonry, after describing, at considerable length, the vices of the priests, proceeds as follows:—

“Another admirable instance of their continence in this respect, presents itself in Gonsalvius, during his relation of what happened in Spain, when the Bull of Pope Paul IV. enjoining to the holy office the cognizance of the crime of *solicitant*, was published. (A *solicitant* is a priest, who, in the act of confession, solicits the penitent confessing, to indecent acts.) Before I advert to the fact, I shall state those words of the Bull that are applicable to the subject: ‘Whereas certain ecclesiastics, in the kingdom of Spain, and in the cities and dioceses thereof, having the cure of souls, or exercising such cure for others, or otherwise deputed to hear the confessions of penitents, have broken out into such heinous acts of iniquity, as to abuse the sacrament of penance in the very act of hearing the confessions, not fearing to injure the same sacrament, and him who instituted it, our Lord God and Saviour Jesus Christ, by enticing and provoking, or trying to entice and provoke, females to lewd actions, at the very time when they were making their confessions.

“ When this Bull was first introduced into Spain, the Inquisitors published a solemn edict in all the churches belonging to the archbishopric of Seville, that any person knowing, or having heard of any friar or clergyman’s having committed the crime of abusing the sacrament of confession, or in any manner having improperly conducted himself during the confession of a female penitent, should make a discovery of what he knew, within thirty days to the holy tribunal ; and very heavy censures were attached to those who should neglect or despise this injunction. When this edict was first published, such a considerable number of females went to the palace of the Inquisitor, only in the city of Seville, to reveal the conduct of their infamous confessors, that twenty notaries, and as many Inquisitors, were appointed to minute down their several informations against them : but these being found insufficient to receive the depositions of so many witnesses ; and the inquisitors being thus overwhelmed, as it were, with the pressure of such affairs, thirty days more were allowed for taking the accusations, and this lapse of time also proving inadequate to the intended purpose, a similar period was granted not only for a third but a fourth time. The ladies of rank, character, and noble families, had a difficult part to act on this occasion, as their discoveries could not be made of any particular time and place. On one side, a religious fear of incurring the threatened censures, goaded their consciences so much as to compel them to make the required accusation ; on the other side, a regard to their husbands, to whom they justly feared to give offence, by affording them any motives for suspecting their private conduct, induced them to keep at home. To obviate these difficulties they had recourse to the measure of covering their faces with a veil, according to the fashion of Spain, and thus went to the inquisitors in the most secret manner they could adopt. Very few, however, escaped the vigilance of their husbands, who, on being informed of the discoveries and accusations made by their wives, were filled with suspicions : and yet, notwithstanding this accumulation of proofs against the confessors, produced to the inquisitors, this holy tribunal, contrary to the expectations of every one, put an end to the business, by ordering, that all crimes of this nature, proved by lawful evidence, should from thenceforth be consigned to perpetual silence and oblivion.” *Narrative, &c. by Hippolyto Joseph Da Costa Pereira Furtado de Mendonca, vol. i. p. 117—119.*

This was not like an instance of an individual priest or two, in a nation, in the course of a century, being detected in the practice of wickedness. It shows that the disease was universal, the whole mass was corrupted ; and the fact that both husbands and wives continued in the same communion, and submitted their consciences, and trusted their salvation, in the hands of the same ghostly guides, shows the influence of a judicial infatuation and hardness

of heart to which they must have been abandoned, because they received not the love of the truth that they might be saved.

Mr. Gavin gives an account of a priest who made his dying confession to himself, in which he acknowledged that for twelve years he belonged to a club of priests, six in number, residing in contiguous parishes. Every one, he said, had a list of the handsomest women in his parish, and when any one had a fancy to see any one of them, the priest of the parish sent for her to his own house, under some religious pretext, and had her introduced to his brother priest. In this way, said he, we have served one another for twelve years past. "Our manner was to persuade their husbands and fathers, not to hinder them any spiritual comfort; and to the ladies, to persuade them to be subject to our advice and will; and that in doing so they should have liberty at any time to go out on pretence of communicating some spiritual business to the priest: And if they refused to do it, then we would speak to their husbands and fathers not to let them go out at all; or, which would be worse for them, we should inform against them to the holy tribunal of the Inquisition." *Master Key*, vol. i. page 29. Thus, under the cloak of letting them go to confession, Papists become accessory to the prostitution of their wives and daughters.

It is now time that I should think of drawing the subject of auricular confession to a close; but it would not be fair to do so without examining what the church of Rome adduces as scripture authority for the practice. Know then, gentle reader, that the front argument from scripture is contained in these words of our Saviour to his apostles, John xx. 21. "Receive ye the Holy Ghost; whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven, and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained." From this the "Papist truly represented," argues, that Christ gave the apostles "and their successors, the bishops and priests of the catholic church, authority to absolve any truly penitent sinner from his sins."

This I say is the front argument of the church of Rome for auricular confession; and I request the reader to look at it again, and to take his Bible, and read the passage in its connection, and he will find that there is not a word of confession in it. The remitting, or retaining of sins here, is connected with the gift of the Holy Ghost, under whose divine influence the apostles, as ambassadors of Christ, were authorized to proclaim the forgiveness or remission of sins, to all who should receive the testimony concerning Christ; and in the same authoritative manner, to declare the everlasting perdition of those who received not their testimony. The sins of the former were remitted, and the sins of the latter retained, according to their inspired declaration; and thus what they bound on earth was bound in heaven, and what they loosed on

earth was loosed in heaven. But the question recurs, what have we here to do with auricular confession? And the answer must be, nothing at all.

But we shall see how the late Bishop Hay of Edinburgh extracts the duty of confession out of these words:—"What is sacramental confession?" *Ans.* It is the laying open the state of our souls to a priest, by humbly accusing ourselves to him of all our sins, in order to obtain the grace of absolution. *Q.* Is this confession of our sins necessary for obtaining absolution? *A.* It is ordained by Jesus Christ as a condition absolutely necessary for this purpose; insomuch, that without it, the grace of the sacrament of penance, by which our sins are pardoned, and we restored to the friendship of God, will not be bestowed upon us. *Q.* How does this necessity appear from Scripture? *A.* It is included in the very power which Jesus Christ gave to the pastors of the church, of binding and loosing, of remitting and retaining sins. For by giving them this power, he constituted them judges of our souls in his own stead, the ministers of reconciliation between God and the sinner; consequently, it is his will that they should exercise this power with justice and discretion, according to the merits of the case, and the dispositions of the penitent; for we cannot suppose he intended that they should exercise it at random; it would be impiety to suppose that. Besides, as this tribunal is not a tribunal of strict vindictive justice, for punishing the offender to the extent of what he deserves, seeing nothing less than hell fire is the proper punishment of mortal sin, but it is a tribunal of mercy, where, by the sentence of absolution, the sinner is delivered both from the guilt of his sins, and from the eternal punishment due to them; and this eternal punishment is exchanged for a temporal punishment, which, through the merits of Christ applied to our souls in this sacrament, both contributes to satisfy the divine justice, and is most wholesome and salutary to the penitent; it is doubtless the will of Jesus Christ, that the priest, when he exercises the power of binding, and lays this penance on the penitent, should do it with a just proportion to his guilt and dispositions. Now, it is self-evident that the priest can neither act with justice and prudence, in forgiving and retaining sins, nor observe the just proportion in imposing the proper punishment suitable to the guilt and dispositions of the sinner, unless he knows the real state of his soul, both as to his guilt and dispositions; and, as none can possibly discover this to him but the sinner himself, hence it manifestly follows, that the very power of binding and loosing, of forgiving and retaining sins, given by Jesus Christ to the priests of his church, necessarily includes a strict obligation on sinners to lay open the state of their souls, by a humble confession of all their sins to a priest, in order to receive the effect of that power, and to be ab-



solved from their sins by him." *Sincere Christian Instructed*, vol. ii. pp. 77, 78.

Perhaps the reader will expect an apology from me for giving such an enormous quantity of nonsense, in one quotation. I have done it for the double purpose of showing the manner in which the greatest Popish writers overwhelm with words a subject that cannot bear to be openly exposed; and the circuitous process, by which they derive the duty of auricular confession of sin to a priest: When drawn from under its overwhelming verbiage, the argument is simply this:—The priest cannot remit sins till he know them; he cannot possibly know them but by the confession of the sinner, ergo, it is the duty of every man to confess his sins to a priest. Thus the very imperfection and ignorance of the priest is given as a reason for trusting in him. It is declared that he has the power of remitting sin, and granting absolution; and at same time, it is admitted that he cannot possibly know what sins a man has committed, or whether he be a sinner at all, until he shall learn the fact from the person himself who applies to him for absolution. I wish all who go to confess their sins to a priest had but the sense which a heathen king displayed in addressing the wise men of his court, which by a little accommodation may be applied to the case in hand. Dan. ii. 9. Tell me my sins, and then I shall know that you can grant me absolution.

There is a sense, indeed, in which the pastors of the church may be said to grant absolution; that is, when persons having been separated from communion in consequence of some public sin, or some sin publicly known, are, upon evidence of repentance, restored to fellowship. This is not forgiving sin, but receiving back a sinner, believing that God has forgiven him; and we believe this only when we have evidence of genuine repentance. A free and open confession is one evidence of repentance; but it is not a confession of secret sin that is required. It is enough that confession of this be made to God, who knows it already. In the case of the church, the confession must also relate to some sin that is known already, and that has been an occasion of scandal. Confession is not required for the purpose of discovering secret sins against God; but for ascertaining the state of mind of the sinner, with regard to what has given public offence; and if there be reason to believe that he really repents, he is absolved; that is, restored to his place in the church which he had forfeited. But this, in every point, is very different from confession and absolution in the church of Rome.

Bishop Hay finds another authority for auricular confession, in these words, 1 John i. 8. "If we say we have no sin we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us: If we confess our sins, God is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse

us from all iniquity." Plain common sense could find nothing of auricular confession to a priest, in these words; for there is no mention, and not the most distant allusion to a priest in the whole chapter, unless we shall suppose the inspired writer speaking of himself and the other apostles under that character, when he says, the things which we have seen and heard declare we unto you, &c. Yet this *wordy* prelate speaks of his proof from this passage in the following confident style: "This testimony is so strong and clear, for the necessity of confessing our sins, that our adversaries have no other way to escape the force of it, but by vainly pretending that the apostle means only the confessing our sins privately to God alone." We do not only pretend, but firmly maintain, that the apostle in this passage, speaks of confessing sins to God, and to no other; though the grave Bishop should reckon this so small a matter that he calls it *only* confessing to God, whereas confessing to a priest, is, in his opinion, the great and indispensable thing. The structure of the language will bear no other meaning than that the confession must be made to him who is faithful and just to forgive; that is, God, as in the version from which the Bishop quotes. It is the pronoun *he* in our version; but it evidently relates to the substantive, God, in the 5th verse. But let us see how Bishop Hay extorts the doctrine of confession to a priest out of this passage:—

"But that this (*i. e.* confession to God alone) cannot be the apostle's meaning, is evident from two strong reasons; first, because *the confessing our sins* is here put in opposition to the *saying we have no sin*; these two are opposite to one another, and therefore must certainly relate to the same object. Now who is there in his senses that would seriously dare to say to God in private *that he has no sin*? In this part of the sentence, then, the Apostle certainly means saying, *we have no sin before men*; and, consequently, in the opposite part of it, when he says, "if we confess our sins," he necessarily means the doing so *before men also*." This is doubtless a most precious piece of Popish logic. The whole weight of the argument, if argument it can be called, rests upon the words, if we *say* we have no sin; and even these conclude nothing in the Bishop's favour, unless they necessarily mean, saying *aloud before men*. Now so far from necessarily meaning this, they do not mean this at all. They refer to what a man *thinks* or *says in his heart*. If we say we have no sin we deceive *ourselves*. It is by what a man thinks, or says to himself, that he deceives himself; but by what he says aloud before men, he deceives not himself, but others. Besides, Bishop Hay ought to have known that some men are guilty of doing every day what he says no man in his senses will do; that is, saying to God that they have no sin. Christ described a class of men under the character of the Pha-

isee, who not only said to God he had no sin, at least such other men had, but boasted of a great deal of merit. And this must be the case with every Papist when he has received the absolution of his priest, and performed his penance.

“Again,” proceeds Bishop Hay, “St. James says, ‘confess your sins one to another, and pray for one another, that you may be saved.’ Here we see, in express terms, the confessing our sins to man laid down as a condition of our salvation. His reverence admits that there is a difficulty in the words *one another*, which he attempts to remove, but he only smothers it with a great heap of words. So far as the words of the apostle go, they make it as much the duty of the priests to confess to their people, as of the people to confess to the priests.

In the following, the reader will see how the meaning of the plainest passages of scripture is perverted by such writers as Bishop Hay, and indeed by all Popish writers.—“St. Paul,” says he, “speaking of the reconciliation of sinners to ‘God, says, God hath reconciled us to himself by Christ; and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation. For God, indeed, was in Christ reconciling the world to himself—and he hath placed in us the word of reconciliation; we are therefore ambassadors for Christ, 2 Cor. v. 18. In these words, the apostle declares, that whereas God, through the merits of Jesus Christ, reconciled the world to himself, he was pleased to appoint the apostles, and their successors in office, to be the ministers of this reconciliation; that is, to be his substitutes on earth for applying to the souls of the people the means obtained by him for communicating the grace of reconciliation; and for this purpose, says the apostle, he placed in us the word of reconciliation, by which means we are made the ambassadors of Christ. Hence, then, it manifestly follows, that if the pastors of the church be the ministers of our reconciliation with God, if the *word of reconciliation*, the power of pronouncing sentence of absolution upon us, *be placed in them*, it is, of course, by their ministry alone, that we can obtain this reconciliation. Christ instituted no other way; therefore, it is our strict obligation to have recourse to them for this benefit, by laying open before them the state of our souls in the sacrament of confession, that they may apply to us the means of our reconciliation, in the way that Christ requires of them to do.” *Sincere Christian instructed, &c. vol. ii. p. 82.*

The apostle’s doctrine in the above cited passage, is, that when Christ died upon the cross, “God was in him reconciling the world to himself;” that is, taking away the grounds of difference which stood between him and sinners of the human race, “not imputing to them their trespasses;” but imputing them to Christ, who voluntarily took them upon himself, that he might make atonement for them. thus it is said, “he bore our sins in

his own body on the tree." "For God made him who knew no sin, to be sin for us, that we might be the righteousness of God in him." It was thus that God reconciled us to himself; and we are said to be reconciled to God by the death of his Son. Now, says the apostle, "he hath given to us the word of reconciliation." This was not to effect the reconciliation; for Christ himself effected it. It was not even to apply the means of reconciliation, as Bishop Hay calls it, for it is the Holy Ghost alone, that can apply the benefits of Christ's death to the souls of men. It was, as the apostle himself plainly declares, the gospel with which he was put in trust, and which he calls the word of reconciliation, because it shows the way by which we become reconciled to God. The apostles received a commission from Christ himself to preach this gospel to all the world. Thus they became his ambassadors; and as such they beseeched men, in Christ's stead, to be reconciled to God: that is, to believe in Christ, and acquiesce in the divine plan of salvation, which is called submitting to the righteousness of God.

The apostles never professed, like this arrogant priest, to put themselves forward as Christ's *substitutes*. They did not even call themselves ministers of reconciliation, as the Popish priests do. They were only ministers of the *word* of reconciliation, which is an expression of precisely the same import as the modern phrase, preachers of the gospel. They were indeed ambassadors of Christ. They received their *commission* directly from himself. They were endowed with extraordinary and miraculous powers for the exercise of their functions; and so guided by the Holy Spirit in all their ministrations, as to declare the mind of their Master with infallible certainty. In these respects they had no successors; and there is no need of any; for they are to us in their writings as much the ambassadors of Christ as they were to those who were subjects of their personal preaching. By their word they are still beseeching men in the name of Christ to be reconciled to God.

Let no one imagine that by these remarks I mean to undervalue a standing ministry in the churches of Christ; I know this to be as really of divine appointment as the apostolic office itself. I know that he who gave apostles and prophets, for laying the foundation of the church, gave also pastors and teachers for its edifying, or building up. But the latter have no right to put themselves in the place of the former, much less to exalt themselves above them, as the silliest Popish priest does, when he requires persons to confess their secret sins to him, and when he gives himself out as a minister of reconciliation, as one who is able to grant pardon of sin by means of his sacraments, and to restore sinners to the favour and friendship of their offended Creator.

THE  
**Protestant,**

No. XCIV.

---

SATURDAY, APRIL 29th, 1820.

---

**THE** subject of satisfaction for sin is intimately connected with that of confession. The one, indeed, is incomplete without the other; for let a sinner make ever so good a confession, and let him even have received full absolution, it is necessary that he perform his penance; that is, make satisfaction to divine justice for his sins, in his own person. That I may do the church of Rome all manner of justice, I shall, as usual, lay down the doctrine in the very words of their own standard authors. The following is Gotter's statement of what the church of Rome disavows, and of what she avows; which was published and approved "by the late venerable and reverend Dr. Richard Challoner Bishop of Debra, and Vicar Apostolic of the London district The twentieth edition."

"**OF SATISFACTION.** The Papist misrepresented, believes very injuriously of Christ's passion, being persuaded that his sufferings and death were not sufficiently satisfactory for our sins but that it is necessary for every one to make satisfaction for themselves. And for this end, after he has been at confession, the priest enjoins him a penance; by the performance of which, he is to satisfy for his offences: and thus confidently relying on his own penitential works, he utterly evacuates Christ's passion; and though he professes himself a Christian, and that Christ is his Saviour, yet by his little trusting to him, he seems to think him to be no better than what his crucifix informs him, that is, a mere wooden one.

"The Papist truly represented, believes it damnable to think injuriously of Christ's passion. Nevertheless he believes, that though condign satisfaction for the guilt of sin, and the pain eternally due to it, be proper only to Christ our Saviour; yet penitent sinners being redeemed by Christ, and made his members, may in some measure satisfy by prayers, fasting, alms, &c.

for the temporal pain, which, by order of God's justice, sometimes remains due after the guilt and the eternal pains are remitted. So that trusting in Christ as his Redeemer, he yet does not think that by Christ's sufferings every Christian is discharged of his particular sufferings, but that every one is to suffer something for himself, as St. Paul did, who, by many tribulations, and by suffering in his own flesh, filled up that which was behind of the passions of Christ; and this not only for himself, but for the whole church, Coloss. i. 24.; and this he finds every where in Scripture, *viz.* people admonished of the greatness of their sins, doing penance in fasting, sackcloth and ashes, and by voluntary austerities, endeavouring to satisfy divine justice. And these personal satisfactions God has sufficiently also reminded him of in the punishments inflicted on Moses, Aaron, David, and infinite others; and even in the afflictions sent by God upon our own age, in plagues, wars, fires, persecutions, rebellions, and such like: which few are so atheistical but they confess to be sent from heaven, for the just chastisement of our sins; and which we are to undergo, notwithstanding the infinite satisfaction made by Christ, and without any undervaluing it. Now, being thus convinced of some temporal punishment being due to his sins, he accepts of all tribulations, whether in body, name, or estate, from whence-soever they come, and with others of his own choosing, offers them up to God, for the discharging his debt; still confessing that his offence deserves yet more. But these penitential works he is taught to be no otherwise satisfactory, than as joined and applied to the satisfaction Jesus made upon the cross; in virtue of which alone, all our good works find a grateful acceptance in God's sight."

The above is the entire chapter on satisfaction. I request the reader to study it closely, and then to say if he does not find that what is called the misrepresentation, is substantially the same as the representation; and this is the case with most of the articles in the work. The author gives what Protestants allege against the church of Rome, in such language as he chooses to put in their mouths: he usually begins his answer with a sentence of damnation; and then, with a "nevertheless," he comes round to admit and defend the very same doctrines, though in different words, and generally in words which are less explicit, and therefore more susceptible of a double meaning.

Take for instance the first sentence of what is called the misrepresentation in the above extract:—The Papist "believes very injuriously of Christ's passion, being persuaded that his sufferings and death were not sufficiently satisfactory for our sins; but that it is necessary for every one to make satisfaction for themselves," or "for himself," as it should be; for Papists do not

write very grammatically. Compare this with the following words of the Papist truly represented, and say where is the difference? "Penitent sinners being redeemed by Christ, and made his members, may in some measure satisfy by prayers, fasting, alms, &c. for the temporal pain, which, by order of God's justice, sometimes remains due after the guilt and eternal pains are remitted." And "by voluntary austerities endeavouring to satisfy divine justice." Here it is plainly admitted, that persons may in some measure satisfy divine justice for themselves, which is the very thing alleged against them, in what they call a misrepresentation of them; and that this is a disparagement of the passion of Christ, and a declaration that his sufferings and death were not sufficiently satisfactory, must be evident to all who understand the terms.

The following sentence alone contains the substance of what Protestants allege against the church of Rome; and there cannot be a plainer avowal that Papists consider the sufferings of Christ as not sufficient. "So that trusting in Christ as his Redeemer, he yet does not think that by Christ's sufferings every Christian is discharged of his particular sufferings, but that every one is to suffer something for himself, as St. Paul did," &c. We shall see by and by, that St. Paul did no such thing; but maintained the very opposite doctrine, namely, that he would trust, or glory in nothing but the cross of Christ, that is, in Christ's sufferings to the death as an atoning sacrifice—a sacrifice by which divine justice was fully satisfied.

If a man were to speak ever so truly of the light of the sun at noon, and to say that he trusted in it as very useful to enable him to follow his lawful calling; but if "nevertheless" he would insist on setting up a farthing candle, as a necessary or profitable addition, and above all, if he paid much more attention to the trimming and admiring his farthing candle, than to using the light of the sun for its proper purposes, all the world would say that he considered the sun's light as insufficient; nay, that he despised it, and thought very injuriously of it, seeing he found himself so deficient in point of light, as to be under the necessity of making an addition of his own.

My simile falls short of what I mean to represent by it; for there is light in a burning farthing candle; and when it is held up in the face of the sun there is more light than there was before. There is an actual addition of light, however imperceptible; but with regard to the point in hand, it is absolutely impossible for all the creatures in the universe to make an addition to the satisfaction which Christ made to divine justice by his sufferings; and, therefore, the man who attempts to make such an addition, believes more "injuriously of Christ's passion," than the man does

of the light of the sun who attempts to help it by means of a farthing candle.

This is not a subject to be treated with levity. It requires to be considered with the utmost seriousness; though when Papists speak of *their* satisfying divine justice in some measure, we cannot think that they are serious, but upon the supposition that they consider God as such a one as themselves, as one who thinks lightly of sin, and whose justice is easily satisfied.

God, as our creator and lawgiver, is entitled to the constant and entire obedience of our hearts, and of our whole lives. But we have failed in this duty of obedience; and by our disobedience have become enemies to God in our minds, and by wicked works. As enemies we deserve to suffer the wrath of God to the uttermost. There can be nothing meritorious in the sufferings of persons who deserve to suffer. The sufferings of sinners, therefore, can never satisfy divine justice, or effect their reconciliation with God. The law by which transgressors are condemned, makes no provision for their reconciliation, but hands them over to the executioner of divine vengeance. To satisfy divine justice, it is necessary to suffer to the full extent of what one's sins deserve; and no man in the world can do this, for the wages of sin is death;—the penalty of transgression is everlasting destruction.

To satisfy divine justice for the sins of men, nothing less would be accepted than the sufferings of one who had no sin. Thus the perfect holiness of Jesus Christ is declared to have been essentially necessary, in order to his making satisfaction for the sins of his people. Had he had any sin of his own, all that he suffered would have been due to divine justice on his own account, and he could not have effected the reconciliation of himself, much less that of others. "Such an High Priest became us (was necessary for us), who is holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, and made higher than the heavens; who needeth not daily, as those high priests (under the law) to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins, and then for the people's," Heb. vii. 26, 27. He offered sacrifice for the sins of the people when he offered up himself; but in order to his doing this acceptably and availably, it was necessary that he should have no sin of his own. His sacrifice satisfied divine justice, because it was a sacrifice "without spot;" and because it was presented by him, who, "though he was a Son, yet learned obedience by the things which he suffered; and who, being made perfect, became the author of eternal salvation to all them who obey him." Heb. v. 8, 9.

Now, the effect of Christ's suffering is, eternal life to all them that obey him; that is, to all who believe in him; for to believe



in Christ is the obedience of the gospel. This is the work of God, that we believe on him whom he hath sent. Faith in Christ is the first thing that God requires of every sinner to whom the gospel is sent ; it is the first thing that he will acknowledge and accept, as of the nature of obedience to his command ; and it is the root and animating principle of all other obedience.

Now the satisfaction to divine justice which Christ made by his sufferings and death, is declared to be so absolutely perfect and complete, as to effect the full and everlasting reconciliation of all who believe in him. "By him all that believe are justified from all things, from which they could not be justified by the law of Moses," Acts xiii. 39. According to the tenor of the new covenant, the Almighty declares concerning all who are interested in it, "their sins and iniquities I will remember no more," Heb. viii. 12. Those who by nature were far from God, both in state and character, "are made nigh, by the blood of Christ," Eph. ii. 13. "And you," says the apostle Paul to the believers in Colosse, chap. i. 21, 22. "you that were sometime alienated, and enemies in your mind by wicked works, yet now hath he reconciled, in the body of his flesh through death, to present you holy, and unblamable, and unreprouvable, in his sight." Now, such is the high privilege of those who are so reconciled to God by Jesus Christ, that nothing at all stands marked against them. "There is no condemnation to them who are in Christ Jesus," Rom. viii. 1. Their sins are blotted out absolutely and for ever, so far as regards *punishment* in any sense of the word ; and it would not be consistent with justice to exact the smallest degree of punishment, seeing Jesus Christ made full satisfaction, when he gave his life a ransom for them.

No man, who understands the nature and design of Christ's sufferings, could imagine for a moment, that God still required something in the way of suffering, by sinners themselves, in order to satisfy his justice. The idea is absolutely heathenish. It has its origin in false notions of the character of God, such as prevail among all heathens, and among all who have corrupted the true religion, and who change the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man. This notion, however, is interwoven with the very essence of Popery. Without her confession, and her satisfaction to divine justice, by stripes or by money, the church of Rome would be as destitute as the poor idolater, Micah, who exclaimed, "You have taken away my gods, and what have I more ?"

It may be worth while to spend a few minutes in considering the sort of satisfaction which Papists profess to make to divine justice, in order to escape the temporal pain which is due to their sins :—these are "prayers, fasting, alms, &c." and "voluntary

austerities." And so, it seems, in the esteem of the holy and infallible church of Rome, prayer is considered a suffering and a punishment, by which, among other things, they expect to make atonement for their sins. Among Christians, it is considered a precious privilege to have access to God, in the name of Christ, by prayer and supplication, for those things which we have need of: but among Papists, the case is very different; their prayers are things in which most of them can take no interest being chiefly in an unknown tongue; and consisting in the incessant repetition of the same words, without having any distinct ideas attached to them. It is quite natural to look upon such an exercise as a punishment: the error consists in supposing that it is an atonement for sin. Under the notion of its being a punishment, there was policy in ordaining prayer to be in an unknown tongue; but it is surprising that they do not use a language less musical than the Latin. What exquisite torture would the low Dutch, or Anglo-Northumbrian, inflict upon an Italian ear!

I grant that a person may suffer a great deal by fasting, if carried to excess; but so far as it is prescribed as a Christian duty, I have no doubt it is salutary both to body and mind. Almsgiving can be considered as a punishment only by persons who worship their money, and who believe not the words of Christ, "It is more blessed to give than to receive."

There may be suffering enough under the head of voluntary austerities; but to think that God is pleased with such things, nay, that he is so well pleased with them, as to accept them "gratefully" as a satisfaction for sin, shows that the most false and degrading notions of the character of God are entertained by the church of Rome. When one thinks of the bloody character of Popery as it appears in this article alone, he cannot help comparing Romish worship with the cruel rites of heathen idolatry; and though he must allow that the worshippers of Juggernaut exceed in their austerities and self-tortures any thing that he sees among Papists, he considers both as acting upon the same principle; both serving an idol that delights in human misery—that requires one to torture his own flesh; another to offer the fruit of his body, as a satisfaction for the sin of his soul.

I shall not torture the minds of my readers by describing the bloody austerities, either enjoined or voluntary, which Papists practise in the way of penance, in order to satisfy divine justice. I shall confine myself to such as are more harmless, and such as are ludicrous, of which I could present an abundant catalogue.

St. Dominick began to afflict his body at a very early period of life; for we learn from the Golden Legend, printed in London, 1527, that while yet an infant, he would often rise out of his cradle, and lay himself naked upon the cold ground. The author

does not inform us what were the particular sins for which the infant imposed this penance on himself. St. Francis, as Bonaventure testifies, used to call his body, Brother Ass, because of the rigorous severities, continual whippings, and coarse diet, with which he treated it. Indeed, if he treated his ass in the same manner as his own body, he was guilty of great injustice to the innocent beast, that had never confessed any sin that required penance. The saint took care to sprinkle all his food with ashes. If he had done the same with an ass's food, it is likely the good sense of the beast would have induced him to leave the whole mess to his master. St. Ignatius, the father of the Jesuits, immediately after his conversion, put himself *incognito* into an hospital, where he fasted whole weeks with bread and water, except on Sundays, when he eat a few boiled herbs, but sprinkled with a good seasoning of ashes. He girded himself with an iron chain, wore a hair shirt, gave himself a comfortable whipping three times a day, slept little, and lay upon the cold ground. He resolved to continue these austerities all his life, to go barefoot to the holy land, and then choose a wild desert for his permanent residence. When he had first begun to gather disciples in Paris, and had gained Peter Faber to him, he used with him to lie abroad in winter evenings upon the snow and ice, gazing upon the heavens; and then stripping themselves to their shirts, lay the remaining part of the night upon the cold heap. St. Macarius did penance by going naked six months in a desert, suffering himself to be stung with flies. This penance the saint had imposed upon himself for the sin of having killed a flea. See a work entitled, *The Enthusiasm of the Church of Rome*, which contains great abundance of such matter.

It would be to burlesque all religion to say that such things as these are acceptable to God, or that they are sufferings which satisfy divine justice; yet the church of Rome holds them forth in this light; and at this very day, in Ireland, the poor people are so deluded by their priests, as to believe that by such means they can make satisfaction for their sins. A gentleman of that kingdom, at present in Scotland, tells me that it is a common thing with the priests there, to enjoin upon their penitents, a long journey, as a suitable satisfaction to divine justice for the sins which they have confessed. A sinner in a remote district is thus compelled to travel to the county town, which is, perhaps, forty miles distant, and the priest takes special care that the work shall be done; for the penitent must bring a ticket from the clergyman of the place, to certify that he was there; if such clergyman be an ordinary priest the ticket costs so much; if a bishop so much more; and the penitent must be very careful that he attend to no other business in that journey, but that of making satisfaction to divine justice, or doing penance for his sins. If he do any other business whatever, he loses the whole benefit of his journey, and must

do it over again. My friend relates an instance of a poor man who had performed his penance to the extent enjoined upon him. He appeared before the clergyman of the place to receive his ticket; but the holy father observing a piece of new leather in his pocket, asked what it meant. "Why, please your reverence," said the poor man, "I have bought a bit of leather in this town to mend my shoes when I go home." The priest kindly told him that this vitiated his whole work of satisfaction; so he was sent home without his ticket, to make his journey over again.

The Papist truly represented says, that "he does not think that by the sufferings of Christ, every Christian is discharged of his particular sufferings: but that every one is to suffer something for himself, as St. Paul did, who, by many tribulations, and by suffering in his own flesh, filled up that which was behind of the passions of Christ, and this not only for himself, but for the whole church." Let it be observed that the representer is speaking of such sufferings as satisfy, in some measure, divine justice; and let the reader look at the apostle's own words, Coloss. i. 24. and he will see that they imply no such thing as Papists would extort from them. The apostle is speaking of the afflictions which awaited him in the discharge of his duty as an ambassador of Christ, and which he willingly endured for the sake of the church; but none but a Papist would ever attempt to fix upon him the absurdity and impiety of adding, by his sufferings, to those of Christ, by which he satisfied divine justice for the sins of his people.

There are many errors contained in this one article of Popery, which I have barely room to mention, as I do not wish to occupy another Number with the subject:—First, it is maintained that after the eternal punishment of sin is remitted, in consequence of Christ's satisfaction, divine justice still requires some temporal punishment, which is contrary to all that the Bible teaches with regard to the perfection of Christ's sacrifice, and the full acquittal of all who believe in him. Secondly, the afflictions of Christians in this world are considered as punishments inflicted by divine justice; whereas they are really the effects of divine goodness, and are beneficial to those who are tried by them. A third error, besides those which I have exposed at length, is that which represents the punishment of nations by plagues, wars, &c. as inflictions of divine justice, "notwithstanding the infinite satisfaction made by Christ," as if this were something that God required to satisfy his justice over and above what Christ suffered. Now the sufferings of Christ have no relation at all to nations as such, but only to the individuals of all nations who believe in him. The wicked suffer the punishment of their own sins; but never to the extent of satisfying divine justice; therefore their suffering continues for ever.

THE

# Protestant,

No. XCV.

---

SATURDAY, MAY 6th, 1820.

---

MY Galloway correspondent, who subscribes himself "A Friend to Fair Dealing," has favoured me with a long and pretty well written letter. The greater part of it consists of remarks on my reply to his queries in my 85th Number, with which he is not satisfied. The things on which he animadverts, however, regard rather myself and my writings, than the public cause in which I am engaged. For instance, he affects to find me wrong in asserting that it never was a matter of consideration with me or my Protestant readers, what we would, and would not *permit* Government to do. He accuses the good citizens of Glasgow of not permitting government to do something, when they opposed the Church Bill. He is not pleased with my allusion to the man in the moon. He is still of opinion that I ought to attack the Radical Reformers, as being more dangerous than the Papists; but I hope he is convinced by this time that the Radicals are under the control of much more powerful weapons than my pen. He thinks that my writings have too long turned aside the eyes of my readers from the real cause of alarm, and directed them to a quarter which bears no very threatening aspect in comparison of the other. And he labours at great length to justify the practice of the priest's taking money for church dues from poor widows, even though they are supported by public charity. If I were to insert all that he has written on these subjects, and make particular replies, it would take me over a great deal of ground that I have already trodden, and it would fill two or three Numbers, which would be too great an encroachment on the reader's patience. He has, however, brought forward some new matter, which I shall give in his own words, and add such remarks as I may think necessary.

"In perusing," says he, "some of your later Numbers, I have had occasion to notice some very good specimens of your *impartiality* and *consistency* of argument. You mention with much approbation the establishment of the Hibernian Schools, for the purpose of teaching the people of Ireland to read the Bible. All this is very good; but from some passages which have escaped you, it would appear that your approbation of them proceeds from

a desire to diminish the authority of the Catholic religion, and to make proselytes to Protestantism, as much as from any desire to communicate instruction. ‘Had the same efforts,’ you say, ‘been made fifty years ago,’ that are made now, and which you blame British Christians for not doing sooner, ‘the Pope would not at this day have had such hold of the consciences of the Irish people: and it is to be hoped that fifty years hence, he will have no hold of them at all.’ In order to preserve the semblance of liberality, to be sure, you say that you would not deprive them of the privilege of endeavouring to gain converts; of doing what they can by *fair argument*, to make proselytes. From what follows, however, it appears that you would wish to make the privilege turn to as little account as possible, because you express a doubt if there be such a thing as *fair argument* among them, and assure us that you never saw or heard of it. You give every encouragement in your power to Protestants to tell Papists that they are in error, and that they are training up their people in error and idolatry. You establish it as the undoubted right of the British Legislature to establish schools for the education of the subjects; and I suppose you would consider it to be a very arbitrary government which would deprive any society or individual of the privilege of educating their children in their own religious principles. I suppose if Mr. Scott or Dr. Kelly were to employ any of their communion to come into your house, or that of any of your Protestant friends, and teach your or their children, to furnish them with Popish catechisms, and to bring them up in the Catholic faith. If further, when you were employing your paternal authority and influence to prevent such teachers from obtaining a residence with you, and your children from listening to their instructions, (as I take it for granted you would,) they should ask you, as you do them, ‘What right have you to such influence?’ and should accuse you of rebellion and sedition for employing it: would not you have reason, think you, to complain of ‘efforts made to diminish your influence, and mar your interference, in the religious and moral education of your children?’ Yet at the same time you will take every liberty short of absolute force, to instruct, that is to convert, Papist children, (because you are sure they cannot be saved unless they are converted); but you will neither allow Papists the exclusive right of the religious and moral education of the youth of their communion, nor to enforce the rules of their order upon those who depart from them.

“In proposing further queries to you, I would mention the following as one. In the beginning of your answer alluded to, you set out by saying, that ‘an obscure son of the church, has done you the honour of addressing you a letter,’ alluding to the one I formerly sent you; and that ‘it is the only one you have received from *holy church* since you published that of W. D.’ By ‘the church,’ and the ‘holy church,’ I take it for granted you

mean the Catholic church; and by my being a 'son of that church, it is equally clear you are satisfied that I am a Catholic. Now I ask you, by what superior illumination, gift of the Spirit, or mechanical impulse, were you assured that I was a Catholic? or to speak more rationally, from what premises in my letter could you draw such a conclusion?

"It seems indeed to be a maxim with you to form conclusions from very lame premises, to ascribe actions to motives very foreign to them, and to force consequences out of them, which they were never intended or never calculated to produce; inso-much that were you appointed a judge upon men and their conduct, I suspect that your decisions would be at least equally summary and unwarrantable with those of the Pope, or the court of Inquisition. You who can confidently arraign the Archbishop of Tuam with the guilt of denying original sin, because, in a common mode of speaking, which perhaps no man but yourself would have taken offence at, and which is surely not more objectionable than your "immense files of letters," he mentioned the 'innocent and unsuspecting youth of his charge;'—you who insinuate a charge of rebellion against the Papists on account of their claiming, what every one of us claims, and what Government establishes, viz. a right to educate the youth of their communion in their own principles, and to use their endeavours to prevent others from interfering with that right: you who can confidently pronounce W. D. to be no Christian, if he do not at your requisition immediately leave the communion of the church of Rome, and who can infallibly judge that he does not wish to serve God from his heart with all his strength, for this very reason because he is a Papist;—you who can make a Papist guilty of renouncing his Saviour, and forfeiting his eternal salvation, because he believes in transubstantiation, &c. &c.—will find no difficulty in pronouncing one to be a Papist, which with you, I suppose, is a term synonymous with a reprobate, merely because he does what every one is bound to do, namely to expose error and misrepresentation, wherever he sees it, and against what party soever it is employed.

"From your unchristianizing of W. D. if he continue in the church of Rome, and declaring all Papists void of sincerity in the service of God, because they are such;—from your pronouncing the church of Rome to be the antitype of Babylon; the place where Satan has his seat; the reverse of what the name she retains, (that is, Christian) implies; and that the gates of hell have prevailed against her;—as well as from many other inferences you draw from the Popish faith and worship,—I think it may be understood, that you hold for certain, that the church of Rome is not the church of Christ; and that therefore, it is the duty of all Christians to withdraw themselves from her communion, and to renounce her jurisdiction. Believing that these are your sentiments till you contradict them, I now ask you, as my concluding

question at present, Upon what warrantable grounds do you hold the foresaid opinions?

"When you have answered these, you may expect some more queries and remarks on your work, from

"A FRIEND TO FAIR DEALING."

I have quoted only about a third part of the letter, and yet I have introduced a good deal of matter that is merely personal, and that has little relation to the questions at issue between the church of Rome and THE PROTESTANT; and which, therefore, I shall despatch in as few words as possible. For instance, of what importance is it to the public to be informed how I knew that the writer was a Papist? He does not deny the fact: and if I inferred it from "very lame premises," he ought to give me the more credit for my sagacity. Short as his first letter was, I *guessed* from the style and manner of it, that the writer was a Papist. I have now become so familiar with the Popish mode of writing, that I find it as easy to distinguish it, as to distinguish the features of a Jew in the streets of London. I would not pretend to decide with infallible certainty in either case; because it is possible to be mistaken; and I might have been mistaken with regard to the religion of my correspondent. Had it been so, I would readily have acknowledged it; but I shall not easily be induced to make an apology for being right.

My correspondent might have satisfied himself, without so many words, that I hold for certain that the church of Rome is not the church of Christ; and that it is the duty of all Christians in her communion, if there be any, to withdraw themselves from her immediately. This I hold as a fundamental principle in my controversy with the church of Rome. I declare that she is not the church of Christ, but the greatest enemy that Christ and his church ever had in the world; and when my correspondent asks upon what warrantable ground I hold such an opinion, I must refer him to what I have already written. It has been my object under every head of discussion to draw this inference, that the religion of Rome is the very opposite of the religion of Christ. The church of Christ is built upon the "foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone;" but the church of Rome is built upon human tradition; and she does not even profess to have a more solid foundation than a fallible creature, whom she calls St. Peter. The church of Christ acknowledges only one object of worship; namely, "the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ;" but Rome, falsely called Christian, has as many objects of worship as Rome pagan had. Every member of the church of Christ is taught to deny his own righteousness, however great it may appear to be in the sight of fellow-creatures, and to trust in that of Christ alone for the salvation of his soul; but the members of the church of Rome are taught to trust in their



own righteousness, and in that of mere creatures like themselves ; to trust in their own works, or in the works of some whom they call saints. The church of Christ is composed of persons who are born again ; “ created anew after Christ Jesus unto good works ; ” that is, who are subjects of the Holy Spirit’s gracious and powerful influence, and who are made holy in life and conversation ; but the church of Rome does not even pretend to any greater regeneration than a priest can effect by means of his holy water ; and she does not exhibit in the conduct of her members, not even in that of her priests, more real holiness of life than is to be found among mere men of the world, who make no pretensions to Christianity. The church of Rome, therefore, is not the church of Christ, but the counterfeit and the enemy of it. My correspondent might have seen this, if he had read all my papers with attention ; and if he has not read them all, I request that he will do so without delay ; and this may perhaps save him the trouble of writing some of the other queries which he has in reserve to send me, as it is likely he will find that I have answered them already. I shall be glad, however, to receive as many as he pleases ; and I shall answer them too, if they shall be such as relate to the subjects of the controversy.

If I had not guessed the fact before, I would have discovered that this “ Friend to Fair Dealing ” was a Papist, from the *unfair* manner in which he perverts my words and misrepresents my meaning. I did not bring a charge of rebellion against Papists for claiming a right to educate the youth of their communion in their own principles ; but I do charge them with opposing the benevolent design of their Protestant neighbours and rulers, when they do all that lies in their power to prevent them from teaching poor children to read the Bible. I did charge the Pope with an impertinent interference with the civil and domestic affairs of Ireland ; and I do not hesitate to say that those bishops and priests who encourage, and endeavour to give effect to such interference, are guilty of a misdemeanour, which in some countries would be held equal to rebellion. I did not say that W. D. was no Christian if he did not at my requisition immediately leave the communion of the church of Rome ; but because if he did not so, *he was not a man of his word* ; and I would say of any Protestant as well as of any Papist, if he is not a man of his word he is not a Christian. Speaking of my correspondent himself, I did not call him “ an obscure son of the church,” as he pretends to quote my words ; but ‘ *a more obscure,* ’ &c. that is, more obscure than the Pope and the Popish Archbishop of Tuam, whom I had just mentioned. I spoke of him as obscure only comparatively, but not absolutely ; for he may be a priest for any thing that I know.

It is true, indeed, that I did in effect charge the Popish Archbishop with denying original sin, when he spoke of the *innocent* youth of his communion ; and I would say the same of any other

man who should use such language in a public address intended for the direction of persons who are called teachers of religion. I know that in light conversation, where words are often used in a loose sense, it is usual to call those innocent, who are comparatively so; and, if speaking of actual sin, I would have no hesitation in calling infants innocent: but the Archbishop was not speaking of infants, but of youth, whose original depravity must have manifested itself in many of the bitter fruits of actual transgression: and we cannot suppose him to use words in a loose sense in a well studied address to all the learned clergy of his diocese. As, however, the church of Rome holds the doctrine of original sin, and as it would not be the design of the Archbishop to deny it, he ought not to be offended, but rather to thank me for admonishing him to be more careful of his language.

I readily confess, that if Mr. Scott and Dr. Kelly were to come into my house, and to attempt to inculcate nonsense and blasphemy even upon my servants, I would send them about their business; and I hope all my Protestant friends would do the same; but this is not the true state of the question: my correspondent, in the most Jesuitical manner, shifts it off the proper ground. I was speaking of the Popish influence which was exercised, not in the way of teaching Popery, but in the way of opposing the teaching of the Bible. I even went so far as to concede to Papists the right of doing all that they could do, by means of fair argument, to gain proselytes, and to prevent their people from becoming Protestants; but I am far from conceding to them the right of preventing Protestants from doing what *they* can by mere persuasion to gain Papists, young or old, from error and idolatry, to the knowledge of the truth, and the service of Jesus Christ. Popish priests have no right to speak of their children, because they cannot lawfully have any; but supposing Dr. Kelly and Mr. Scott to have numerous families, I would not think it lawful to force myself into the midst of them, and to endeavour to convert them, without their consent. I have no wish to diminish the lawful influence of parents of any religious persuasion, or to prevent their interference in what they may consider for the good of their families; but what I complain of, is the influence, and the interference, that will not permit those who wish for education to themselves and families to receive it. I claim no right to thrust myself into Popish families against their will, though my object should be the important one of teaching the word of God; but when both parents and children are willing to be taught, and eagerly desiring to learn to read the Bible, as many of them are, I should consider myself entitled, nay, urgently called upon, to gratify their desire, and that in spite of all the priests in the world; and I do complain of the influence of the priests exercised to prevent those who desire instruction from receiving it. This is an influence and interference which ought to be marred and effectual-

ly put down, for it is inconsistent with British freedom, as well as with the benign spirit of Christianity.

My correspondent is right when he says, 'I am sure that Papist children cannot be saved unless they be converted.' I am perfectly sure of this; and I am equally sure that neither can Protestant children be saved unless they be converted. The word of God concludes all under sin; and there is no name by which any can be saved but that of Jesus Christ; and my object in recommending the Hibernian and other societies, that are teaching the poor Irish to read the Bible, is not with the view of making them Protestants merely, but of making them Christians, through the knowledge of that Saviour whom the Bible reveals. I would "not allow the Papists the *exclusive* right of the religious and moral education of the youth of their communion;" for they have no title to it. Every youth among them has a right to seek for the best education he can get, and every British subject has a right to communicate instruction to all who are willing to receive it.

The cavils of my correspondent admit of a much larger exposure; but I satisfy myself with the above, which I hope will also satisfy my readers in general, though it will not satisfy him. I conclude the present Number with the declaration of another Irish Bishop against the use of the Bible in Schools; which is taken from an Irish Newspaper.

TO THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CLERGY OF THE DIOCESE OF  
CLOYNE AND ROSS.

"REVEREND BRETHREN,

"During a series of years, from the time that Schools were opened in Ireland, under the patronage of humane and respectable Protestants, for the professed purpose of educating poor Catholic children gratuitously, without infringing in any respect upon their religious principles, we have had repeated cause to complain that these liberal professions were uniformly deviated from; and so widely as to force us into effectual opposition. It was, we imagined, to be presumed, that when the education of the Irish poor became a national concern; when a great number of distinguished personages noted for rank, learning, and affluence, formed an Association avowedly for this benevolent purpose; when the Imperial Parliament not only patronised the measure, but supported it by an abundant annual grant,—it was, we hoped, to be presumed, that the narrow views of certain bigotted individuals would be liberalized by the above expanded Association, and would merge in its wide liberality. We were the more warranted in this hope by the third Article of the Laws, which were to regulate the proceedings of the Association; for it is there expressly declared, that the leading principle of the Society is to afford equal facilities for education, to all professing Christians, without any attempt to interfere with the peculiar religious opinions of any.—Yet, in too many instances it became difficult to reconcile the

practice of the Association with its previous professions. But at the last General Meeting in Kildare-street, on the 24th day of February, the rejection of Mr. O'Connell's motion by so great a majority as 80 against 19, has evinced beyond the powers of tergiversation, that the professions of the Society were not intended to regulate its practice ; but that under the name of education, proselytism was the determined object. To Mr. O'Connell, for his spirited exertions on this occasion, the thanks of Catholic Ireland are eminently due ; and surely, if confiding apathy had hitherto benumbed any individual among us, the present electrifying fact must restore his energies, and rouse him to a due sense of the danger. With you, my Rev. Brethren, I am long and intimately acquainted.—Your sentiments on the Bible without note or comment, as an initiatory book for schools, are well known to me. It is important, however, at this juncture, and after what was flippantly asserted at the above Meeting, that these sentiments be emphatically declared to the entire kingdom. The Roman Catholic clergy of every other diocese, may now probably feel bound to proclaim their sentiments also. For my own part, I have long since recorded mine upon this subject. The brightest luminaries of the Protestant church have led the way for us, with arguments, to this very moment, unanswered. I shall not here advert to them ; neither is it necessary that you should. Your opinion, I am confident, will be unanimous, and in perfect accord with what has been lately published by the Most Rev. Dr. Kelly, of Tuam, the Rt. Rev. Dr. Doyle, of Kildare and Leighlin, and the Rt. Rev. Dr. Archdeacon of Kilmacdugh and Kilsfennora. The plan suggested by the last named prelate, and more forcibly recommended by Mr. O'Connell, for educating children of the different religions, in the same school, without any reference to religious subjects, which may more properly be treated by their own clergy in their respective places of worship, has my entire assent, and shall have my most cordial co-operation. Mutual confidence, good understanding, and brotherly regard, may be thus happily promoted throughout this hitherto distracted country ; a blessing so invaluable, that every effort should be made by us for the attainment of it. No real friend of Ireland will, I trust, be backward to affix his name, and contribute his support, to Mr. O'Connell's project of a National Association for educating the Irish Poor. That such project may be speedily adopted, and that it may promote all the good intended by the benevolent patrons of it, is the ardent prayer of your faithfully devoted friend and humble servant,

“ WILLIAM COPINGER.”

*R. C. Bishop.*

*Cove, March 6th, 1820.*

THE  
**Protestant,**

No. XCVI.

---

SATURDAY, MAY 13th, 1820.

---

I THOUGHT I had done with Dr. Kelly of Tuam, when I finished my remarks on his own archiepiscopal manifesto against the Bible and the schools in which it is taught ; but I find that this manifesto, together with that of the Pope which occasioned it, has laid the foundation of certain proceedings which require to be noticed in such a work as " THE PROTESTANT." It is evident that the Popish clergy in Ireland are in such a state of anxiety and alarm as was never witnessed before. They are in the condition of persons who know that there is an enemy at their door, and this enemy is *the Bible*. This is precisely the state in which I wish to see them, while they look upon the Bible *as an enemy* ; but whenever they shall become reconciled to it, and accept of it as a precious gift of God to sinful men, I wish that their alarm may cease, and that they may enjoy all the peace and comfort which it imparts to every one who truly receives it as the word of God.

I concluded my last Number with an Address by Bishop Coppinger to the clergy of his diocese, in which he also discovers his dread of that alarming book, which has been in fact the occasion of all the calamities which have befallen the church of Rome, during the last three hundred years. Our Irish Papists have found out that the Bible is not only formidable in the hands of men and women ; but that even in the hands of children it is a most dangerous weapon. Children, therefore, must not be trusted with it, lest they should become champions of Protestantism, and eventually overthrow the infallible church.

Following up the Address of the said Bishop, a number of Popish clergymen met, and adopted the following Resolutions, which I take from the Cork Mercantile Chronicle of March 27, 1820:—

" We, the Roman Catholic Clergy of the diocese of Cloyne and Ross, being called upon by our Bishop, the Right Rev. Doctor Coppinger, to declare our sentiments concerning the introduction of the Bible, without note or comment, as an initia-

tory book into Catholic schools, have resolved unanimously, at our several Conferences holden in the course of this present month :

“ First—That in the profession of faith adopted universally throughout the whole Catholic Church, it is stated : “ I also admit the holy Scriptures, according to that sense which our holy mother, the church, has held and doth hold, to which it belongs to *judge* of the true sense and interpretation of the Scriptures ; neither will I ever take and interpret them otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers.”——This article of our belief, precluding, as it does, all private and arbitrary interpretation of the Scriptures, wisely guards the unlearned and unstable of our communion against wresting the sacred volume to their own destruction : it further goes to prevent their being carried about by every wind of doctrine, while it tends to effect what the Redeemer so strongly inculcates, viz. that “ we be all one, as He and his heavenly Father are one ;” or, as the Apostle has it, “ that we be all of one mind, and that there be no schism among us”——while, moreover, it assuredly does not sanction the Bible, without note or comment, as a fit school-book for thoughtless and inconsiderate children.

“ Resolved, Secondly—That however we respect those distinguished personages who patronize and support an opposite system, we never can acknowledge in them, or in any society of laymen, a right to regulate the religious concerns of the poor children committed to our care, much less to force upon them a plan of education obviously incompatible with the principles of their religion.

“ Thirdly—That duly appreciating the advantages of a well-regulated education for the poor, we shall be ever ready to co-operate with the liberal and beneficent Protestants of our respective parishes in establishing schools on any practicable plan, not clashing with our tenets.

“ Fourthly—That the foregoing Resolutions be signed by the several Masters of Conference, in the name and on the behalf of ninety-nine Clergymen, respectively attending these Meetings.

“ Fifthly—That the avowals elicited by Counsellor O’Connell, at the last general Meeting of the Education Society, in Kildare-street, are to us a subject of regret, equally, and of alarm : we shall not be unmindful of them. The splendid advocacy of that gentleman, in the cause of religious freedom, on the present occasion, demands our warmest acknowledgments, and we beg leave hereby most respectfully to present them.

“ The Rev. WM. O’BRIEN, Vicar-General presiding in the Conference of Buttevant.

“ The Rev. J. BURKE, D. D. presiding in the Conference of Fermoy.

“ The Rev. JAMES WALSH, Secretary of the Conference of Middleton.

“ The Rev. JAMES MOLONY, presiding in the Conference of Donoughmore.

“ The Rev. DAVID WALSH, presiding in the Conference of Rosscarbery.”

The above resolutions refer to a Society which has been in active operation for about nine years, and by which many of the poor in Ireland have been taught to read, without distinction of religious profession. It was a fundamental rule and leading principle of the Society, “ to afford equal facilities for education to all classes of professing Christians, without any attempt to interfere with the peculiar religious opinions of any ;” and that “ the Scriptures, without note or comment, shall be read” in the schools ; “ but all catechisms and books of religious controversy excluded.” The Society was composed of both Protestants and Papists ; and they proceeded for some time without any apparent schism, doing a great deal of good ; but some of the more keen-sighted Papists began to perceive what they thought a snake in the grass. They found out that the permission of the Bible, without note or comment, was likely to produce consequences not very favourable to their religion ; and that, moreover, it was inconsistent with the rules of holy church. An attempt was made to expunge that rule of the Society which regarded the reading of the Bible ; which, however, was effectually resisted. A similar attempt was made, in another form, at a meeting of the Society, on the 24th of February last. The champion of Bible exclusion, on this occasion, was Daniel O’Connell, Esq., whose speech is given at length, in a Report of the proceedings of the Meeting, for which I have to thank my indefatigable correspondent in Lifford. If I were to give the speech entire, it would fill the remainder of this Number ; but I conceive it enough to give only those parts which relate more directly to the propriety of excluding the Bible from the schools :—

“ I know,” says Counsellor O’Connell, “ I know that by introducing the mention of the Scriptures, I am treading on delicate and dangerous ground, and shall meet with censure, abuse, and calumny ; but conscious of but one motive, I invite such censure, and court such calumny. My motive is pure, though my opinion may be mistaken. By means of this part of your resolution, you have already commenced to impede, and, as your plan goes along and attracts attention, you will still more and more impede, the progress of your Society among a numerous class. I shall now clearly demonstrate that you do so, from actual facts. You do not grant the means of education to that class to which

I belong. Let me not be mistaken : I shall always be ready to speak my own conviction, that my profession is the best ; if I did not feel it to be so, I would not adhere to it for one hour. Every one here, I will allow, may feel the same. When I do therefore speak on the subject, I must protest against being supposed to infer disparagement to another's belief. I respect human freedom in opinion, and think every created being has a right to worship God according to his conscience : no human dignities would induce me to alter my opinion, whether I uttered it among the senators of England or the inquisitors of Spain.

" Allow me now to revert to the question, Whether making it a preliminary to give the Bible, without note or comment, does not affect the principle ? I say it does :—as long as you insist on its being a school-book, you do not afford equal facilities to Catholics. I prove it thus. I begin with the lowest and humblest of my proofs ; I begin with myself. I have, in a remote county, some property ; not worth speaking of in any other way, than as it imposes on me the duty of assisting in the education of the poor who have claims upon me. I gave a school-house, at a low rent and tax-free, and contributed also ; still, however, we wanted assistance, and looked for it to your Society ; but you would not afford it. I could not let the Bible be a school-book, and you insisted that I should. You, therefore, do not give equal facilities.

" The next proof is from the schools in Tralee, under the Rev. Mr. Egan, supported by the voluntary contributions of tradesmen, containing 440 children. There are in it about seventeen or eighteen Protestants—no interference is used—the Catholics are not even taught in the presence of the Protestants.

" There is another school, under the care of the Rev. Mr. Denny, a very amiable and liberal man. The number in his school is 20. The Catholic clergyman made this proposal : " Let us unite five days out of six—let us teach them indifferently without introducing religious instruction ; let them separate then, and each teach his own ; let us go to the Society and apply for a grant." Mr. Denny would have done so, but that from your resolution he found he could not succeed in such application.

" I state these facts,—for what purpose ? Not that you should decide upon them now, but to call on every honest man to pause and say, whether education is not the assertion of truth ? Whether the man who asserts one thing and means another, be an honest man ? or whether he does not himself most want education, who refuses a committee to inquire whether he may not have been mistaken ?

" Since last meeting, matters have occurred with respect to the Catholic persuasion, which may be matters of ridicule to



others, but are not so to us. The spiritual head of our church has issued what may not perhaps be ligatory on our consciences, even in spiritual matters, and it is well known that we often oppose him in temporals ; but it is at least his advice, *ex cathedra*.—This excludes from Catholic schools the Testament, even with note and comment, even though these might be acceptable to the Catholics. It is, in fact, a Bull of the Pope. This, therefore, has caused an additional difficulty ; see, then, how you proceed : you say that you will afford equal facilities to each persuasion, and on the other hand comes the Bull of the Pope, refusing such aid. Can you now find any one with such powers of face, as to tell me that you give equal facilities ? Nothing but religious delusion can account for this.

“ To be sure, when I last had the honour of addressing you, my friend Mr. Burrowes answered me, and went near to persuade me that I knew nothing of the Catholic persuasion, and made a speech to prove it so ; and a liberal and wealthy merchant, whom I see before me, did the same. I know that I shall have the same to encounter to-day. I did not wish to enter further into such controversies, and therefore applied to some of the heads of the Catholic persuasion in Ireland. On the Most Reverend Dr. Murray I shall make no eulogium. I applied also to the Most Reverend Dr. Troy, and in consequence a meeting was held of the principal parish priests in Dublin, in order that I might have an authentic document to read to this meeting, to express their sentiments ; and they have resolved that “ The Scriptures, with or without note or comment, are not fit to be used as a school-book.”—To be thumbed by every child in the school.

“ I end with a proof that is irrefragable : this document has been sent to me for the very purpose of being read to this meeting. The meeting was held, and this resolution framed, for this very purpose.

“ Now, my Lord Duke, see how this document calls on you to accede to my humble motion, to afford a committee to see if really equal facilities are granted. This document says, “ either with or without comment, it is not to be a school-book ;” your resolution says it shall ; put these together, and see how you can say “ equal facilities.” On the one hand, the determination of the prelates, that it shall not be a school-book ; on the other yours, that you will not give assistance unless it is ; yet you still say, that you cannot see any thing in this document to require at least the decency of a committee,—the decorum of an investigation. As the only thing that is objected to, is the circulation of the holy Scriptures, I will tell you the course you ought to pursue, as honest men :—You ought to come forward to new model your resolution, and also to give aid to such as refuse to use

the Scriptures without note or comment. I well know that I shall hear to-day, as I did last year, something like prose run mad, something like half sermons about the value and the origin of this book, the Bible. (*Applause, mixed with louder hisses.*) If I have trod on the tail of the serpent of bigotry, let it hiss. Oh it was a good hiss! a noble hiss! an excellent hiss! and I thank you for the hiss. Those who hissed may suppose they are acting for the service of God; but they serve God by a falsehood. But there is more honesty in the hiss, than in those gentlemen who assert one thing, and then say and do another. I have stated to you my own opinion, and shall re-state it, notwithstanding the peril of the hiss. The Bible never can be received without note or comment by the Catholic persuasion. Gentlemen hissers, we believe that the entire word of God has not been preserved in writing: we believe that a portion has been preserved in the church which preserved that writing: and this being our tenet, you cannot expect to have the Catholic clergy submit, when their attention is roused, to have the Bible used without note or comment, because they must have *tradition*, which we also call the word of God. Every Catholic is bound in life and in death to assert this;—you assert the opposite in your resolution.”

The reader will see that the pleadings of Counsellor O’Connell proceed upon the ground that the rules of the Society are not consistent with themselves. The leading principle of the Society, “to afford the same facilities for education to all classes of professing Christians, without any attempt to interfere with the peculiar religious opinions of any,” is not consistent with the other rule, which requires that the Scriptures, without note or comment, should be read in the schools. At first, Protestants and Papists met on this, which both, in their simplicity, considered common ground. The Protestant knew that the Bible alone was the foundation of his religion; and the Papist, without considering consequences, agreed to admit the Bible alone (that is, without note or comment) into the schools which were supported by the contributions of both parties. But O’Connell has found out that the Bible alone is not the foundation of his religion; and that therefore, the requiring of it to be read in the schools, is inconsistent with the professed object of the Society, which is, to afford equal facilities for education to both Protestants and Papists. This is a declaration as plain as words can make it, that, in the opinion of Papists themselves, the Bible is against them. They will rather that their children shall go without education, than that they should have access to the Bible. This, however, is by no means the general feeling among the Irish Papists. Thousands of the peasantry are eagerly craving to have their children taught; but since the Pope issued his Bull, which O’Connell ad-

mits to be, "in fact, a Bull of the Pope," the clergy have taken the alarm, and he appears as their agent, in the School Society, in order, if possible, to get the Bible expelled from the schools.

This eloquent Counsellor uses a somewhat curious argument. "The Bible," says he, "never can be received without note or comment by the Catholic persuasion. Gentlemen hissers, we believe that the entire word of God has not been preserved in writing: we believe that a portion has been preserved in the church which preserved that writing: and this being our tenet, you cannot expect to have the Catholic clergy submit, when their attention is roused, to have the Bible used without note or comment, because they must have *tradition*, which we also call the word of God." Now, suppose we grant that what they call tradition is also the word of God, it must be consistent with the written word: if it contain any thing of an opposite character, it cannot possibly have proceeded from the same source; but if it be the word of God, there can be no harm in giving other portions of the same word without it, or it without the other portions. Protestants admit that the Old Testament without the New, and that the New without the Old, is not the whole word of God; but we never suspect danger in giving the one without the other, though we prefer giving both together, when we can. Nay, I venture to affirm that there is not one book in either of the Testaments, which may not be safely given, and profitably read, though the reader should never see another page of the Bible. It is, in fact, to libel the inspired penmen to say that the writings of any of them would be productive of mischief without the guardianship of the rest. How much greater the libel, when all of them taken together are declared to be dangerous, unless they be subjected to the control of an imaginary being, to whom they give the name of tradition, whose authority, in the church of Christ, is of no more value than that of the traditions of the elders among the Jews, which we are assured, by an infallible witness, made void the law.

Besides; if it be dangerous to give the Bible without tradition, it must be also dangerous to give it with tradition, unless you give the whole mass of it. If the written word must not be given without the unwritten, much less must a part of the latter be given without the whole. I defy the church of Rome to say how big a book this would make; but I apprehend the stoutest dray-horse in the kingdom would not be able to move it. And would the grave Counsellor O'Connell really propose to give such a primer to the poor Popish children at school? I apprehend he has no such intention. His object, and that of his reverend Fathers, is merely to get quit of the Bible altogether; and for his exertions in this behalf, the clergy are puffing him up to the skies.

The Counsellor insinuates that the Protestant part of the Society are guilty of duplicity, in professing to give equal facilities for education to all parties, without interfering with the religious opinions of any ; and, at the same time, persisting in giving the Bible to the children. This is plainly admitting, that to give the Bible to a Papist, is interfering with his religious opinions. It is not pretended that any Protestant gentleman of the Society, or any of their Protestant teachers, attempted to expound the Scriptures to the scholars, or to show their conformity with one system more than another. There has, therefore, been no *interference* with the religious opinions of any, in the sense in which they understood the word ; and it is extremely unjust in the orator to bring such a charge against gentlemen who had done no more than what he and his Popish brethren had agreed should be done ; namely, giving the Bible without note or comment. If the Papist believed the Bible to contain his religion, the giving of it was as much an interference with the religion of Protestant children, as the Protestant giving it, was with that of Popish children : and if there was any duplicity in the matter, it must attach to one party as well as the other.

O'Connell's speech received an able reply from Richard B. Warren, Esq. in which, among other things, he proved, that to withhold the word of God from children, would be disobedience to the command of God. In answer to the objection founded on the alleged *profanation* of the Bible, "to be thumbed by every child in the school," Mr. Warren stated that it was not used as a spelling-book ; or used at all, but by those children who had made such proficiency in reading, as to be able to derive instruction from it ; and this, I suppose, is the case in every well regulated school in which the Bible is read.

It appears farther, from Mr. Warren's speech, that many individuals and public bodies had contributed large sums ; that a legacy had been bequeathed ; and that even Parliament had granted pecuniary aid to the Society, on the express understanding that the rules were to be adhered to ; that is, that the Bible, without note or comment, was to be used in the schools. It is presumable that many of the donors would not have given a shilling to support schools from which the Bible was excluded. The measure, therefore, which Mr. O'Connell desired to carry, would have been a breach of faith with both the living and the dead. But as these were only heretics, the thing might, perhaps, in the opinion of Papists, be lawfully done.

THE

# Protestant,

No. XCVII.

---

SATURDAY, MAY 20th, 1820.

---

THE reader is requested to connect what follows with the conclusion of my last Number.

The following striking fact, stated by Mr. Warren, shows how Papists do when they get schools, even supported partly by Protestants, under their own management. "The learned Gentleman has triumphantly referred to the Friars' School in Cork, as a proof of the anxiety, on the part of the Roman Catholic clergy, to promote the education of the poor:—I thank the learned Gentleman for making mention of that school in particular, as I happen to be acquainted with the circumstances which led to its formation. About the time at which this Society was formed, the presence of *Joseph Lancaster*, in this country, excited a very general anxiety on the subject of the education of the poor. A meeting was held in the city of Cork, at which a very large sum was subscribed by all religious persuasions, for the purpose of establishing a school, on such a liberal plan as should be unobjectionable to every denomination of Christians; and after much discussion, it was resolved that the Scriptures should be excluded, lest the children of Roman Catholics might be otherwise prevented from attending. A noble school-house was erected, capable of accommodating (as the learned Gentleman has told us,) seven hundred children; and a Committee was immediately formed; but although many Protestants became subscribers to its funds, few (if any) could be found, who would devote their time to the superintendence of such a school: the management of its affairs consequently fell into the hands of persons of a different persuasion. No statement (as I believe) has ever been published of the system of instruction adopted in this school; but I know, from the testimony of gentlemen who visited it during the last summer, that this institution, which commenced its career by excluding the Scriptures without note or comment, lest it should be offensive to Roman Catholics, has now become a Roman Catholic seminary, in which the Douay version of the Scriptures,

with all its notes and comments, is read, to the effectual exclusion of all children who are of a different persuasion ; for it cannot be imagined that any Protestant would send his child to a school, where he should continually hear those notes read, in which Protestants are so pointedly and repeatedly charged with corrupting the sacred text."

Mr. O'Connell's motion was lost by the carrying of an amendment, by a majority of 80 votes against 19. Mr. O'Connell then declared that he and his friends would be no longer members of the Society.

Bishop Coppinger lauds and praises him, in a high degree, for his exertions in the *holy* cause, as the reader may see in his letter to his clergy, which I gave at the end of my 95th Number. "To Mr. O'Connell," says he, "for his spirited exertions on this occasion, the thanks of Catholic Ireland are eminently due ; and surely, if confiding apathy had hitherto benumbed any individual among us, the present electrifying fact must restore his energies, and rouse him to a due sense of his danger." The "electrifying fact" is, that the Society did, by a majority of 80 against 19, reject the motion of Mr. O'Connell, which was meant to prepare the way for the expulsion of the Bible from the schools. And Bishop Coppinger considers this as having "evinced, beyond the powers of tergiversation, that the professions of the Society were not intended to regulate its practice ; but that, under the name of education, proselytism was the determined object."

I do not profess to be acquainted with the powers of tergiversation. I am not sure if ever I wrote the word before ; but no doubt the Right Reverend Bishop comprehends it in all its extent and power. He, very probably, knows from experience, what it can do, and what it cannot do. In the present instance, it seems, it cannot exculpate the Society from the accusation, that its professions were not intended to regulate its practice. That is, in plain English, tergiversation cannot save the Society from the charge of duplicity ; but I hope the Society will never ask the aid of such an agent to save them from any thing. Let them leave tergiversation, (that is, shift, subterfuge, evasion) to the Papists ; and they will find no difficulty in vindicating themselves by means of plain truth and common sense.

The accusation is, that proselytism, under the name of education, is the determined object. But the Bishop has not adduced, or referred, to a single instance, in which the Society, or its Protestant members, directly or indirectly attempted to make proselytes of Popish children to their own faith. They do, indeed, give them the Bible. They furnish them with means of learning to read it. This is all that can justly be laid to their

charge; and it is not even insinuated that they do more. If proselytes are thus made, it is not they that make them, but the Bible. If children are won to the faith, by this means, it is not to their faith, but to the faith of the Bible. Protestants do indeed believe that their faith is contained in the Bible; but when they give the book itself, without a word of their own, either oral or written, they leave it to speak for itself; and they are perfectly willing that the reader should embrace that which he finds in it, though it should be different from their own opinions. This is not proselytism to the tenets of a party. It is not a Society seeking to gain persons to itself, for the purpose of increasing its own strength; and, therefore, it partakes nothing of the character which Bishop Copinger ascribes to the Society in Dublin. Let it be remembered, that the Papists themselves, at first, agreed to have the Bible, without note or comment, read in the schools. Now, had they found, by experience, that Protestant children were by this means induced to embrace the faith of Rome, we should not have heard a word from them of proselytism being intended, under the mask of education. They would gladly have received all the proselytes which the schools produced; and they would have raised a hue and cry against the Protestants, if they had attempted to prevent such proselytism, or to remove the Bible, which was the cause of it. But they will not allow to others what they claim for themselves. They know and feel by woful experience that the Bible is against them; that no man, woman, or child, will ever find the faith of Rome within its pages. Nay, they know, at least the learned among them know, that the Protestant faith, or something very like it, is to be found in the Bible; and this is virtually acknowledged by Bishop Copinger, and all those of his brethren, who publicly maintain, that simply to give the word of God, without note or comment, is the same as to attempt to make proselytes to the Protestant faith.

The "electrifying fact," that the Society intend to proceed as they began; that is, to teach poor children to read the Bible, is calculated, says the Bishop, to restore the energies of such of his brethren as have been benumbed by apathy, and to rouse them to a due sense of their danger. This danger proceeds from the Bible, and from the Bible *alone*. Will any man, after this explicit avowal, have the effrontery to maintain that the religion of Rome is Christianity? The word of Christ cannot possibly be dangerous to the religion of Christ. But we have the declaration of a Romish Bishop, that it is dangerous to the religion of Rome; from which the inference is unavoidable, that the religion of Rome is not the religion of Christ. I might very properly close my argument here. With those who respect the word of

God, it is enough to know that a thing is against that word ; and knowing this, they are sure that it cannot be of God. This is the state in which the church of Rome stands convicted, and virtually admitted by Bishop Copinger, and all those clergy who, at his call, have been roused to a sense of the danger that arises from the reading of the Bible. And, as it is thus proved, that the religion of Rome is not of God, there is only one other author to whom it can be ascribed,—it is the working of Satan, with all deceivableness of unrighteousness.

Yet, after all, the Papists are extremely desirous of having it believed, that the Bible is on their side. They are like certain litigants, who wish to retain the most respectable counsel ; not that he may advocate their cause, which they suspect no honest man will do, but merely that he may not appear against them. Thus Papists express great reverence for the Bible. They will not even allow it to be thumbed by children, lest it should be profaned by the contact of their fingers with the paper on which it is printed, or the skin that covers it ; though, I suppose, it will be found that he who thumbs his Bible most, pays the greatest respect to it, and makes the best use of it. If you will believe the Romish priests, it is from great veneration of the Bible that they cannot consent that children should read it ; and because they fear they would misinterpret it to their own destruction. They profess to hold the key, that is, the power of rightly interpreting it, in their own hands. Let us see, then, how they interpret some passages. And I venture to affirm, that there is not a child in any of the schools in Ireland, who would expound it so foolishly as Popes and Cardinals have done.

Moses saith, “ God made man in his own image ;” Pope Adrian interpreteth, “ therefore images must be set up in churches.” St. Peter saith, “ Behold, here are two swords ;” Pope Boniface concludes, “ therefore the Pope hath power over the spiritual and the temporal.” St. Matthew saith, “ Give not that which is holy unto dogs ;” Mr. Harding expounds it, “ therefore it is not lawful for the vulgar to read the Scriptures.” St. John saith, “ There shall be one fold, and one Shepherd ;” Johannes de Parisius tells us, “ this place cannot be expounded of Christ, but must be taken for some minister ruling in his stead.” The prophet David saith, “ Thou hast put all things under his feet ;” Antoninus expounds it, “ thou hast made all things subject to the Pope : the cattle of the field, that is to say, men living in the earth ; the fishes of the sea, that is to say, the souls in purgatory ; the fowls in the air, that is to say, the souls of the blessed in heaven.” And whereas, our Saviour witnesseth of himself, “ All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth :” Stephen, Archbishop of Patarca, applied it to Pope Leo the Tenth, in the council of La-



teran, in the audience of the Pope himself, who thankfully accepted it, and suffered it to be published and printed; and, as it is rightly observed by the learned Du Moulin, Pope Innocent the Third, in his book of the Mysteries of the Mass; the book of Sacred ceremonies; Durant's Rationales; Tolet, and Tileman, and others, do most ridiculously wrest the Scriptures, altogether different from their right meaning, and the expositions of the fathers: as for instance, the Scripture saith, "The rock was Christ;" therefore, say they, "the altar must be of stone." It is written, "I am the light of the world;" therefore, "tapers must be set upon the altar." It is written, "Let him kiss me with the kisses of his mouth;" therefore, "the priest must kiss the altar." It is written, "Thou shalt see my back parts," (Exod. xxxiii. 23.); therefore, "the priest must turn his back to the people." It is written, "Wash me again," (*Lava me amplius*, Ps. li.); therefore, "the priest must wash his hands twice." It is written, "Put off thy shoes, for this place is holy," (Exod. iii. 5.); therefore, "the bishop at mass changeth his hose and shoes." The Pope himself, at the time of his coronation, casteth certain copper money among the people, using the words of Peter, "Silver and gold have I none, but that which I have I give thee." See page 259, of Sir Humphrey Lynde's *Via Tuta et Via Devia*; a work which contains a great deal of information, in a small compass. The fourth edition, revised by the author, was published in 1630. The edition before me was published last year, by order of "The Society for the distribution of Tracts in defence of the United Church of England and Ireland, as by law established."

I question if there be a child in any school, in the three kingdoms, who would give such foolish comments upon passages of Scripture as the grave doctors of Rheims have done. Every page of their New Testament is full of downright nonsense, as any one may see who will open the book. The following is the first of their annotations; it is on the name *Thamar*, as it occurs in the genealogy of our Saviour, Matth. i. 3. "Christ abhorred not to take flesh of some that were ill, as he chose Judas among the apostles. Let not us disdain to receive our spiritual birth and sustenance of such as be not always good." This is an exhortation to submit to the priests, be they ever so wicked; than which a more pernicious and dangerous doctrine was never taught by any perverter of the word of God.

Mr. O'Connell goes no farther than to make tradition equal to the Scriptures, as being also the word of God; but some great doctors of the church of Rome go much farther, and declare tradition to be superior to the written word. Thus Cardinal Baronius teaches: "Tradition is the foundation of Scriptures, and

excels them in this, that the Scriptures cannot subsist unless they be strengthened by traditions ; but traditions hath strength enough without Scriptures." (*Baron. An. lviii. n. 2.*) "Traditions," says Linden, "are the most certain foundations of faith, the most sure ground of the sacred Scriptures, the impenetrable buckler of Ajax, the suppressor of all heresies. On the other side, the Scripture is a nose of wax, a dead and killing letter without life a mere shell without a kernel, a leaden rule, a wood of thieves, a shop of heretics." (*Linden, Panopl. l. i. c. 22, &c.*) Costerus, the Jesuit, assures us, "It never was the mind of Christ either to commit his mysteries to parchment, or that his church should depend upon paper writings." Again, "The excellence of the unwritten word doth far surpass the Scriptures, which the apostles left us in parchment ; the one is written by the finger of God, the other by the pen of the apostles. The Scripture is a dead letter, written in paper or parchment, which may be razed or wrested at pleasure : but tradition is written in men's hearts, which cannot be altered. The Scripture is like a scabbard that will receive any sword, either leaden, or wooden, or brazen ; and suffereth itself to be drawn by any interpretation. Tradition retains the true sense in the scabbard ; that is, the true sense of the Scripture, in the sheath of the letter." (*Coster. Eucharist. cap. i. p. 44.*) From Andradius we learn, that "many points of (Roman) doctrine would reel and totter if they were not supported by the help of tradition." (*Andrad. de Orth. expli. lib. 2.*) "Many things," says Petrus de Sutor, "being taught by the Roman church, and not contained in the Scriptures, would more easily draw the people from the traditions and observances of their church." And he shows that this is one special cause why the Scriptures were denied to the lay people. (*Sutor. de Translat. Bibl. c. 22.*) Another reason why traditions are preferred before the Bible, is given by Bishop Canus. "Because tradition is not only of greater force against heretics than the Scripture, but almost all disputation with heretics is to be referred to traditions." (*Canus, Loc. Theol. lib. iii. cap. 3.*) See a great deal more to the same purpose, in *Via Tuta et Via Devia*, edit. 1819, p. 300—309.

Thus it is plainly admitted that the church of Rome cannot stand upon the ground of Scripture. She cannot contend with heretics on any other ground than that of tradition, which is, by these authors, exalted above the Bible. It is easy to see then what sad work Mr. O'Connell, and his brethren, would make in the schools, if they had the command of them. The Bible would be expelled, and they would probably substitute St Wenefride, and the "Life of St. Ann, the Mother of the Mo-

ther of God, and the Grandmother of God himself." See an account of this blasphemous work, in vol. i. page 310.

Bishop Copinger himself deserves to be more particularly noticed. His address to his clergy is written in a very artful style. He endeavours to prepossess the reader, in favour of what he has to say, by complimenting the Protestant Society in Ireland, who have opened schools for the education of the youth of the Roman communion, as humane and respectable. But the compliment seems intended to hold up the Society to the greater detestation, whose professions, the Bishop says, are not intended to regulate its practice; but that, under the name of education, proselytism is the determined object. This great evil, proselytism, is that which seems to have taken possession of the mind of this Bishop, and which he would deprecate as more dangerous than the typhus fever, or the plague itself. Now, the more the Popish clergy cry out against this evil, the more ought Protestants to labour to promote it. I have already said that I wish not to gain proselytes to Protestantism, considered merely as a sect or party; but I wish to gain men from error to truth; from the kingdom of Satan to the kingdom of Christ. If the Bishop were a subject of the latter kingdom, he would be as glad to win them to it as any Protestant can be. That the church of Rome is not this kingdom, but the enemy of it, is what I have been endeavouring to prove; and no man has yet answered so much as one of the arguments by which I have attempted to establish the fact. The church of Rome is a confused mass of superstition, will-worship, idolatry, and all sorts of wickedness. Every benevolent man ought to endeavour to undeceive the miserable dupes of this mother of abominations. Call it proselytism, or what you will, he is engaged in a good work who is labouring to detach men from the religion of the Pope, and to gain them to that of Christ; and I do not think the School Society in Dublin, or the Hibernian Society, or any other, has yet done what they ought to do for the attainment of such an object. Proselytism is not the professed object of these Societies; and they have never, so far as I know, made it appear to be their object, in any shape whatever, further than giving the Bible, and teaching the people to read it; and if that be the thing that makes them vile, in the esteem of Bishop Copinger, I hope he will live to see them become yet more vile.

Popery being proved, and even admitted, by great authors of the Romish faith, to be not founded in Scripture, or even defensible by Scripture, but only by tradition, and that tradition as vague and intangible as the winds; it must appear to every serious reflecting person that the sooner it is overset the better. It is, in fact, a system of falsehood and delusion

invented by the devil, and propagated by cunning and designing priests, to enslave the understanding, pick the pockets, and ruin the souls of men. The work of proselytism has never yet been seriously taken up by Protestants; but I am not ashamed to tell Bishop Copinger, that it is the duty of every Christian to gain as many proselytes as he can to the religion of the Bible; and as I understand my work is republishing in Cork, as well as in Dublin, I hope this will soon meet the eye of his Reverence; and I will be glad if he shall attempt to show cause why the Bible should not be allowed to be read in the schools.

He does not expressly tell us what his sentiments are upon this subject; but he says he has long since recorded them; and he says, "the brightest luminaries of the Protestant church have led the way for us, with arguments, to this very moment, unanswered." Who these luminaries are, the Bishop does not tell us; and perhaps he gives it as a great stretch of liberality to admit that there ever were luminaries among heretics. But I can tell him that there are none, whom Protestants themselves acknowledge to have been luminaries among them, who were not steady friends of the Bible, and desirous that every man, woman, and child, in the world, should have one, and be able to read it. Dr. Copinger will perhaps refer me to a Marsh and a Wix; but these divines, so far as relates to this subject, are in no more estimation with serious Protestants than the Bishop himself, or than the Pope of Rome.

I am indebted to a learned correspondent for the following correction of an expression, in my 95th Number, which is liable to misconception:—"In reading p. 356. l. 40, 41. 'The church of God acknowledges only one object of worship, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ:' Should not this have been a little explicited? The church worships *only one God*; but it considers Jesus Christ, the Son of God, as an object of worship, as well as the Father; because it considers the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, as only one God. St. Stephen prayed to Christ; St. Paul prayed to Christ; and St. John says, 'This is the confidence we have in him, that if we ask any thing according to his will, he heareth us.' (1 John v. 14.) You do not want these proofs of Christ being an object of divine worship; but our Unitarians overlooking them, deny him to be so. The Godhead being one in essence, or *ουσιαν*, as the Greeks call it, but three in *ὑποστασι*, or person, and each person being inseparable from the Godhead, each person is, in truth, the only God, because there is only one God. Our Unitarians, making their own understanding, and not the Scripture, the measure of their faith, deny Jesus Christ to be an object of divine worship."

THE

# Protestant,

No. XCVIII.

---

SATURDAY, MAY 27th, 1820.

---

I FIND by several letters, which I have received within these few days, that great interest has been excited by the extract of Mr. O'Connell's speech, which I gave in my 96th Number. It is, I understand, pretty generally considered as one of the most valuable documents which I have given since the commencement of my work ; because it establishes, beyond all doubt, the important fact, that the Papists of the present day are as hostile to the word of God, as they were even in the dark ages ; and having this fact ascertained, who would hesitate for a moment to pronounce the Church of Rome the very Antichrist ?

O'Connell, standing alone upon his own responsibility, could not have given much importance to the sentiments which he uttered ; but he appears in an official character, representing what Bishop Copinger calls " Catholic Ireland ;" and to him, for his exertions in attempting to expel the Bible from the schools, the Bishop assures us, " the thanks of Catholic Ireland are eminently due." Here, then, is a right reverend pillar of the Roman Church giving the sanction of his high authority to the sentiments avowed by the lay orator. And " the Roman Catholic clergy of the diocese of Cloyne and Ross," adopt the sentiments of their diocesan, and express their " warmest acknowledgments" to Counsellor O'Connell, for his " splendid advocacy in the cause of religious freedom." The whole body of the Roman clergy, then, within that district at least, have declared O'Connell's sentiments to be their own. They cannot allow the reading of the Bible by the children at school, lest the children should become Protestants ; a plain admission that the Bible is the religion of Protestants.

Above all men in the world, Papists possess the art of giving bad things a good name ; that is, of pressing into their service such expressions as are popular, and convey a good meaning, in order to cover some error and absurdity, which they do not like

to hear called by its own name. Religious liberty is one of those phrases which Papists know to be popular in this country, in the present age. They do, therefore, most impudently appropriate it to themselves. They would have the world believe that they only are the friends of religious liberty, though all the world knows that they are the most intolerant and persecuting sect upon the face of the earth. The exertions of Mr. O'Connell, to get the Bible banished from the schools, are called, by the clergy of the diocese of Cloyne and Ross, "his splendid advocacy" "in the cause of religious freedom." In the common acceptation of the words, religious freedom signifies the privilege of every individual's reading the Bible, of forming his own judgment of its contents, of freely expressing what he thinks he finds in it, and of worshipping God according as he understands his will, with regard to the manner in which he ought to be worshipped. This freedom exists in our country, in its fullest extent;—nay, it exists much beyond what I have here stated; for it is not even required that a man shall read the Bible, and form his judgment and practice according to what he finds in it. A man may spend his whole life without ever reading a page of it; and, so far from being compelled to worship his Maker alone, as the Bible teaches, he may worship the Virgin Mary and all the Saints, in direct opposition to the dictates of the divine word; and yet his religion is tolerated. He enjoys the utmost freedom in the exercise of it, without being subjected to pains and penalties of any kind.

But Papists, in Ireland, profess to be in bondage; and they call their orator, O'Connell, the advocate of "religious freedom." The freedom they want, is to be freed from the Bible; and certainly, if any person were insisting upon them, or attempting to compel them, to read and study a book which they hate with a perfect hatred, they might with justice complain that they were not left to the freedom of their own will. But this is not the point in question. There is nobody, so far as I know, so zealous as to propose to compel the Papists to read the Bible; but there are many benevolent persons desirous of giving it to those who are willing to receive it; they are giving it to the children in the schools, and through them to their parents; many of whom desire most earnestly to have it. This is what grieves the priests and their lay orator;—this is what they wish to prevent, by all possible means; and the endeavours of the eloquent Counsellor to prevent this, are called, by the clergy, "his splendid advocacy" "in the cause of religious freedom." That is, the *freedom* of keeping in the *bondage* of ignorance the great mass of the Irish population;—it is the freedom of *compelling* the benevolent part of the community to abstain from every attempt to impart freedom from ignorance, and vice, and misery, to degraded millions

of our fellow creatures. Yes ; our Papists are great advocates of religious freedom ; but it is the freedom of making their will, or that of their ghostly father in Rome, the law by which alone we are to be regulated, in all our thoughts, and words, and actions.

As for the orator himself, it does not appear that he has any distinct knowledge of either religion or religious freedom, or any sentiments of his own upon the subject. He had been actually accused of ignorance of even the " Catholic persuasion," at a former meeting ; and now, therefore, he does not choose to risk his reputation, by speaking from his own knowledge. He " applied," he says, " to some of the heads of the Catholic persuasion in Ireland." He came to the meeting in the leading-strings of Drs. Troy and Murray, and the other clergy who held a meeting for the purpose of furnishing him with " an authentic document to read to this meeting, to express their sentiments ;" and then he gives their sentiments, with as much pomp and solemnity, as if they had been expressed by a voice from heaven. " They have resolved," says he, " that the Scriptures, with or without note or comment, are not fit to be used as a school-book." I believe I said long ago, that a council of bats and owls would probably resolve and declare that the sun was a great nuisance ; and there would be as much wisdom in the declaration as in that of the Roman clergy in Dublin, that the Bible is not *fit* to be read in schools, or any where else.

In the first article, in the resolutions of the clergy of Cloyne and Ross, (see No. 96, page 362), we learn, " that in the profession of faith adopted universally throughout the whole Catholic Church," Papists receive the Bible, in the sense which their holy mother the church held, and doth hold ; that to her it belongs to judge of the true sense of the Scriptures ; and the Papist engages that he will never " interpret them otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers." He who comes under this obligation, binds himself that he will never interpret the Scriptures at all ; for their never was a unanimous consent of the fathers on any leading doctrine of the Bible, much less with regard to all that is contained in it. It is impossible to interpret the Scriptures, without doing it otherwise than some Fathers have done ; and therefore the only safe course is to let them alone. This is most effectually to set aside the Bible ; for it is needless to read it, if we are not to consider the meaning of what we read. If we attempt to understand any part of it, we are entering upon the work of self-interpretation, which the church of Rome so strongly deprecates. It is well that the Roman clergy of the present day have made such an explicit avowal of their principles ; because they will thus convince every

reflecting person that they have abandoned the ground of Christianity, and have taken their stand upon that of downright infidelity.

And if, in the regions of infidelity, there be degrees of wickedness, as I doubt not there are, that system must be the most wicked which professes to be founded on the word of truth,—this is Popery. The Church of Rome has not the honesty of the hardy infidel, who, at once, rejects the word of God; but she has the low cunning of professing to respect it, while she most effectually sets aside its authority. There cannot be greater insolence practised in civilized society, than to misconstrue an honest man's words, and turn them against himself; but this is the insolence with which Papists are continually treating the word of God. Thus the clergy of Cloyne and Ross have the effrontery to profess to quote the words of the Bible against the use of the Bible. Like all other writers of their communion, they make use of the words of Peter, relating to the unwise and unstable wresting the Scriptures to their own destruction; and they use this as an argument for withholding the Bible from the lay people altogether. But this was not the tendency of the Apostle's argument: his words clearly imply, that the unlearned and unstable had liberty to read the Bible, else they could not wrest it. Peter asserted the fact, that there were some things in Paul's epistles which the unlearned and unwise did wrest to their own destruction; but he did not, on that account, prohibit the reading of the epistles of his beloved brother Paul;—nay, he proceeds upon the acknowledged fact that they were accessible to all men, and especially to those whom he addressed, that is, to the “strangers scattered abroad,” &c. Paul had expressly written to *them*, as Peter tells us, (2 Ep. iii. 15.) and it was in his address to *them* that there were some things hard to be understood. Now, we cannot suppose that the faithful Apostle, writing under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, would address an epistle to the Hebrew Christians in general, the tendency of which was so dangerous, that he did not wish the people in general to read it, lest it should do mischief to them; yet this impious absurdity is maintained by these Popish priests, who will not allow the word of God to speak for itself to the lay people, lest they should pervert it to their own destruction.

Besides, if the language of Peter shall be considered as authority for keeping the Bible from any person, it will apply much more properly to the priests than to the lay people. There is, comparatively, little danger of a plain man, whose mind is unsophisticated by the jargon of the schools, mistaking or wresting any part of the plain testimony of the apostles, concerning Jesus of Nazareth, the Saviour of sinners; but the priests, who have



been bred in the schools of Scotus, and St. Thomas Aquinas, and Pope Pius IV., are in the greatest possible danger of wresting the Scriptures to their own destruction ; because they come to them, if they do come at all, with minds preoccupied by doctrines quite opposite to those contained in the Bible ; yet with an assurance that they are in the Bible. This is the worst possible state of mind in which persons can come to the study of the word of God ; for then they come to it, not to receive implicitly what the Holy Ghost teacheth, but for the express purpose of making the Holy Ghost speak their own sentiments : that is, of extorting from the Bible what they have already been taught by fallible men in the schools ; and thus they will, almost to a certainty, wrest the Scriptures to their own destruction.

When the wise man spoke of "a jewel of gold in a swine's snout," he referred to something that was quite out of place ; and, I think, nothing can be more so than the passages of Scripture which the clergy of Cloyne and Ross quote from the Bible, about the unity of the church. They tell us, that the receiving of the true sense of the Scriptures simply, as holy church is pleased to give it, "further goes to prevent their being carried about by every wind of doctrine, while it tends to effect what the Redeemer strongly inculcates, viz. that we be 'all one, as he and his heavenly Father are one ;' or, as the Apostle has it, that we be 'all of one mind, and that there be no schism among us.'" Christ speaks of the oneness or unity of his people, as a unity in the truth ; and his word is the truth. The unity of his church is founded in the knowledge, belief, and profession of the truth of God's word ; and this truth does unite all, who believe it, to God and to one another. But these Popish clergy take up the words of Christ and his apostle, which relate to this heavenly union, and apply them to a union that is founded on the exclusion of the word of God, and on human authority substituted for it. This is, in effect, turning the word of God against itself. There is not a more impious way of wresting it ; and as this is the work of the clergy, and not of the poor laity, we ought to exculpate the latter from the accusation which the former are daily bringing forward, that they are not to be trusted with the Scriptures, lest they should wrest them to their own destruction.

Bishop Copinger declares his assent to a plan recommended by Mr. O'Connell, for educating children of the different religions in the same school, without any reference to religious subjects ; and the clergy of the diocese of Cloyne and Ross declare their readiness to co-operate with Protestants, "in establishing schools on any practicable plan, not clashing with our tenets : " that is, upon any plan that shall not incur the risk of the scholars of the Roman communion becoming Protestants. This will be considered by the Papists, I dare say, as a fair concession ; but, in

fact, it is no concession at all; for it is not possible to teach children to read, without giving them an ability to detect the impositions of Rome, even if they should not read the Bible; and this must be, in some measure, clashing with their tenets. Papists, however, must not, in the present state of public feeling, avow themselves the enemies of education. They must make a show of being willing to educate their youth, as the Pope has taught them; but it will soon be seen, that all this zeal has evaporated, unless they shall be able to turn all their schools, like that of Cork, into Popish seminaries.

I intend to commence, in my next Number, a discussion of the alleged supremacy of Peter, and of his pretended successors; and I conclude the present with the following letters:—

#### TO THE PROTESTANT.

“DEAR SIR,—I hope your papers are extensively circulated and read in Ireland. The hostility to the word of God, and the spirit of domination exhibited by the Popish clergy there, demand the most vigilant attention, and the most decided resistance. They have generally or universally applauded and adopted Mr. O’Connell’s sentiments, lately delivered at a meeting in Kildare-street, Dublin, on the subject of the Hibernian Schools. As a specimen of reasoning, his speech was sufficiently contemptible; but the arrogance, effrontery, and spirit of usurpation, exhibited in it, are no less remarkable. One of the provisions of the schools, —a provision adopted by both Protestants and Papists, in order to give equal facilities to children of parents of either profession,—was to exclude all catechisms and controversial writings, on both sides, and to use the Bible, which both parties professed to believe to be the word of God; at same time, leaving the explanation of this to the respective religious instructors out of school. By this plan the Society did afford, what they reckoned, equal facilities of education to the different classes. And on this plan, I believe, many mixed, and some Catholic schools are conducted in other places.

“But, says Mr. O’Connell, ‘No! this is not to give equal facilities. The Pope has lately emitted a bull against the use of the Bible in schools; and the dignified clergy have published, authoritatively, their manifestoes to the same purpose.’ These, whether obligatory or not, are respected by the Catholics; so that the Society, by their rules, must, it seems, accommodate their procedure to every new bull of the Pope, and to every new manifesto of the clergy; or they cannot preserve the facilities for education “*equal*.” O’Connell’s demands amount to no less than this: that the Society, in adhering to one of its rules, should take the meaning of that rule from these authorities, and suffer it, and all

their other rules, to be modified by their dictation. The absurdity is here apparent ; but the arrogance of the demand, and the effrontery of the accusation of dishonesty, applied to the School Society, are intolerable. The Society, at first, explained what they meant by equal facilities of education. They have adhered to that meaning. Who infringed these facilities? The infringers are the Pope, the clergy, and their orator, Mr. O'Connell. But here, as usual, the aggressor is loudest and first in the complaint.

"It is well that such decided opposition to Mr. O'Connell's project appeared at the meeting. Had the Pope's bull been admitted, in this instance, with the clergy's manifesto, and the traditions of the church, Protestants might have bidden adieu to all interference with the schools. Say the clergy, 'We never can acknowledge, in any society of laymen, a right to regulate the religious concerns of children committed to our care.' 'Regulate,' i. e. so much as to give the Bible with or without note or comment, &c., and without attempting to teach them its meaning on controverted points. Had the Society submitted to this usurpation, a new bull might have been soon expected, excluding all school-books not approved by the Pope; excluding the Bible from the use of even Protestant children, lest they should communicate the sentiments of their books to the rest; excluding Protestant children and Protestant teachers for similar reasons. All this, and more, would accord well with what Popery used to be; and if bulls, manifestoes, traditions, and the Church, are to regulate these matters,—adieu to any thing saving Popish management. We know not what the next bull and manifesto may contain;—we know not; Papists themselves know not; Mr. O'Connell knows not, what is contained in the treasury of the traditions. The infallible church holds the keys of this treasury, and no person can tell where this church is to be found; for we find the individuals who profess to belong to it, often opposing each other, in doctrine and in practice.

"It required no small degree of effrontery in Mr. O'Connell and the clergy, to mention such a proposal to the Society, as submission to such foreign and usurped domination, and such undefinable authority; but it accorded well with the Popish system. The Pope refuses to a British people and Parliament, the right to instruct subjects in their youth, by that perfect rule of morality, justice, and loyalty, which the Bible contains. The clergy claim authority over all the young people and their parents, not only without their consent, but against it. This, especially in a Protestant country, is usurpation. They have no right to any power, but by voluntary submission. All this, however, is but arrogance and domination with respect to fellow creatures. God says, "Hear my word;" and, respecting Christ,

"Hear my Son." The Pope and his clergy say, "No; at your peril, hear us only." *Thus*, God said to the first pair, "Obey my voice;" the old serpent said, "Nay; obey mine." But God's word shall stand. Even to Popes and their clergy, as well as to other egregious sinners, he mercifully says, "Hear, and your souls shall live."—Yours,

"May 16th, 1820.

"AN IRISHMAN."

---

"Glasgow, 15th May, 1820.

"DEAR SIR,—I was extremely glad to see, in the "PROTESTANT" of Saturday last, that you have again brought the enemies of the Bible into notice. Too much cannot be said, in reprobation of their misanthropic principles; and it will require all the eloquence of the Irish barrister to make them appear otherwise than odious. The Counsellor blames the Hibernian Society, for not showing a readiness to enter into an investigation of their resolutions, and for not removing or avoiding the obstacles thrown in the way of affording "equal facilities for education to all classes of professing Christians." But if Papists, belonging to the Society, who certainly knew their own circumstances best, could not foresee the consequences of standing upon common ground with the Protestants, how could it be thought that the latter would anticipate them? Is the idea to be entertained, for a moment, that such a respectable body, connected, as it is, with some of the most distinguished personages of the British empire, and whose majority, I presume, is composed of friends to Bible reading, will crouch to the bull of a Pope, or the determination of the prelates of his communion? This, however, is precisely what they would wish to see; nor is this all, if we may judge from the conduct of their Tertullus; they would be "lords of the ascendant," and dictate, whenever they pleased, what gentlemen ought to do; and then, with the utmost effrontery, impute falsehood and dishonesty to those who might, in any degree, disapprove of their measures, or differ from them in opinion.

"But suppose, for the sake of argument, that the Bible and Testament were excluded from the schools in question, would this satisfy these alarmists? No: they would, if possible, extort farther concession, until nothing but the superstition of Jesuits and Douay doctors was inculcated on the simple and unsuspecting, of the Protestant, as well as the Popish persuasion; and, instead of being commended as Timothy was, for having "known the holy Scriptures, which are able to make men wise unto salvation," they would be reproved as fools, for "following lying vanities, and forsaking their own mercy."—"I am, &c.

THE  
**Protestant,**  
No. XCIX.

---

SATURDAY, JUNE 5d, 1820.

---

As an introduction to the subject of Papal supremacy, I lay before the reader the following communication, by a judicious and intelligent correspondent:—

“ TO THE PROTESTANT.

“ DEAR SIR,—I have ventured to trouble you with a few thoughts on the Pope’s supremacy. As the whole Popish system is built on that supposed supremacy bestowed exclusively on Peter, to whom they pretend the keys of doctrine, worship, discipline, and government, were committed; and as you do not appear to me, as yet, to have designed a full and formal discussion of that subject, I shall take the liberty to suggest a few hints to you, which probably may be of use to you, to facilitate the discussion of it, and which you are so capable to improve upon. The first and main text on which they build, is that in Matth. xvi. 18. “ And I say unto thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven,” &c. The Apostle John records a circumstance which will give us a little light into this matter; speaking of Peter, he says, ch. i. 42. “ And he brought him to Jesus. And when Jesus beheld him, he said, Thou art Simon the son of Jona, thou shalt be called Cephas, which is, being interpreted, a stone.” Cephas is not a Greek but a Syriac word, and therefore required to be translated into the Greek language, in which the New Testament was wrote. The Greek word, therefore, is *Petros*, a stone; and, strictly speaking, such a stone as we can handle, or turn over and move from its place. When names were given to men, as recorded in Scripture, whether compounded or not with the names of animals, or inanimate things, it was done in allusion to the natures and qualities of these animals, or things. And it was not the Jews only that practised this, but other nations also.

“What the reasons were why our Saviour gave him this name we are left to conjecture, as they are not revealed. What they were not, we can decide upon, positively, as they are revealed. The obvious qualities then of such a stone, are hardness or durability, and mobility. That this name, then, was not given him to signify his stability or infallibility is most certain ; for of all the Apostles, both before and after the ascension of Christ, he was the most unstable and versatile.

“Witness his effrontery in taking upon him to rebuke his master, which drew from him this severe retort, “Get thee behind me Satan, for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but the things that be of men.” Also his denying his Lord and Master ; likewise his dissimulation, for which the Apostle Paul reproved him to his face. These are the only three things in which the Popes are successors to Peter, and may be said to form the Pope’s triple crown. I question if Peter himself knew the meaning of his new name, or had it explained to him at that time ; but I have no doubt but he would come to understand it in that night of dreadful darkness and perplexity, after he had denied his master, and saw him condemned and crucified, when his busy mind would be searching on all sides for comfort, he would then think on the name Christ had given him, connect it with his prayer for him, and draw hope and comfort from it. As if Christ had said, “Simon, Simon, you think you are a strong and stable man, little considering how fallible you are, how easily turned about like a stone, or wheat in a sieve, by Satan, who desires to sift every particle of faith out of you ; but I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not.” Hereby he would know the reason of his being compared to a stone, in regard to its durability, that he should not be, like numberless other substances, liable to be utterly decomposed, or dissipated into smoke. We shall now see what bearing this has upon the above quoted passage in Matt. xvi. It is there said, “And I say also unto thee that thou art Peter.” Here the translators have made a mistake, which, though at first sight it may appear trifling, yet is of serious import in different respects ; it puts into the mouth of Christ what appears a childish senseless conceit,—“And I say also unto thee, that thou art Peter.” Here the word Peter stands in the verse as a mere name, without connection, and so without sense or meaning. Besides, though Christ gave him this name, he never afterwards addressed him by it, but always by the name Simon. It should have been translated, “And I say also unto thee, that thou art a stone, and upon this rock.” Here is another mis-translation to which the former has given rise, for the Greek particle *καί* is frequently used as an adversative,—in English, *but* ; and so it must be used here, because our Saviour manifestly contrasts

Petros, a moveable stone, with Petra, an immoveable rock: "But upon this rock." Here the translators are short again, it should have been, "the rock," for the Greek article is put to it, which always pointed to a particular person, or thing, already known. But upon this "the rock," that you have so often read of in all the Old Testament, "the rock that begat thee;" "the rock of ages;" "the rock of salvation;" "the rock of refuge;" and, as Paul says, "they drank of that spiritual rock which followed them, and that rock was Christ." It is impossible, therefore, that Christ could mean the same persons by Petros and by Petra, as they are different words, and of different genders, and the accidents opposite—mobility opposed to immobility. The whole verse then will run thus, "And I say also unto thee, that thou art a stone, but upon this, the rock, I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." The Greek word *δε*, rendered *also*, being a disjunctive conjunction, is meant, therefore, to distinguish between things that are spoken about. The plain sense and meaning of the verse then will be, "And I say unto thee, that notwithstanding of this glorious revelation now made unto thee, be not high-minded, but fear; beware of thinking too highly of thyself, this will give thee no pre-eminence. Though I have called thee to be an Apostle, remember the name I have given thee—a moveable stone; and that thou wilt find ere Satan have done with thee. Thou art not fit, therefore, to be a foundation for my church; no, it is upon this rock alone, (in all probability pointing to himself), whom thou hast confessed to be the Christ, the Son of the living God, that I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." It would appear here that our Saviour, foreseeing what would come to pass, meant to leave Papists totally inexcusable, by pointing out how entirely unfit Peter was for a foundation to his church. Besides the church, both of the Old and New Testament, is but one church, and must, therefore, rest on one foundation—Christ. For Paul says, "Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ," and "are built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner stone." Signifying, according to the Greek construction, that Christ was the foundation the apostles and prophets themselves built upon. The Apostle Peter himself says the very same thing, 1 Pet. ii. 6. And it is not unworthy of remark, that the Apostle Peter sanctions all Paul's epistles, and ranks them along with the Scriptures of the Old Testament; a thing decidedly against the Papists, who could wish all Paul's epistles sunk in the bottom of the sea. 'Tis a wonderment that they have never as yet seen this, as an evidence of Peter's fallibility. But let us see what could entitle Pe-

ter to such a distinguished favour, for Christ appears to address him in terms of high consideration,—“Blessed art thou, Simon Barjona, for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven.” Was it simply because he had it revealed to him? Certainly not, for there could be no merit in that, though he was blessed in having it revealed to him. Was it because he had it exclusively revealed to him? Surely not, for the knowledge and acknowledgment of this was the very ground on which all the disciples joined him, and in which even his brother Andrew had the start of him, John i. 41. “We have found the Messias, which is, being interpreted, the Christ.” Was it because he was more beloved by Christ than the rest? No; none of them had grieved him so much; besides, John was the beloved disciple, and would, therefore, have been preferred to the supremacy before Peter. Was it because he was more solid and stable than the rest? No; any of them would have had it before Peter for this reason. As this confession of their faith was common to them all, so they were all equally blessed, and so the keys were given unto them in common; and they had all in common the promise of the Spirit to enable them to exercise them, as appears from Matt. xviii. 18. What he says in the xvi. chapter to Peter individually, he says in the xviii. chapter to them all universally. All this must go for nothing with the Pope, who can impose any sense upon Scripture he pleases; he can even contradict the most express commands of Christ; and, what is still more base, make Christ contradict himself in the most flagrant manner. What can be more flagitious than to pretend that Christ gave the supremacy to Peter, after he had prohibited them, in the most express and peremptory manner imaginable, to exercise superiority one over another, Matt. xx. 20. When James and John, with their mother, came to Christ to ask of him this piece of pre-eminence, to set the one on his right hand, and the other on his left, in his kingdom, it is said, “and when the ten heard it, they were moved with indignation against the two brethren. But Jesus called them unto him, and said, Ye know that the princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, and they that are great exercise authority upon them.” And Luke adds, “and they that exercise authority upon them are called benefactors. But it shall not be so among you, but whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister.” Can words convey a more direct and peremptory prohibition than this? Impossible; especially if we consider the kind of example used, and caveat added. Christ does not take his example from the high-priest under the law: that did not suit the object he had in view; for though the high-priest had the inferior priests under his hand, as it is said, yet the duties of both were clearly



prescribed to them by the law. But the kings of the Gentiles were all perfect despots : their will was the law. But such is the Pope of Rome, his will is the law ; so that Bellarmine says of him, “ if he should command vice to be virtue, and virtue to be vice, the church is bound to believe it.” A remarkable incident took place upon presenting the petition of these two brethren. It is said, “ and when the ten heard it, they were moved with indignation against the two brethren.”

“ This is precisely what might have been expected in the present state of human nature ; and the same ambition, after such a seducing object, will ever produce the same effects, as it ever has done. Witness the wickedness carried on in the conclave : what lying, fraud, knavery, bribery, perjury, hypocrisy, and contention ; and out of doors, what wars and excommunications, Pope delivering up Pope to the devil, and frequently setting all Europe in a flame,—the native consequence of ambition, and this direct violation of Christ’s command, and caveat likewise.

“ According to Mosheim, the bishops, that is presbyters, or overseers, as the word bishop in the original signifies, and they were undistinguished in their character during the first and second centuries, “ The bishops,” he says, “ who lived in the cities, had, either by their own ministry, or that of the presbyters, erected new churches in the towns and villages adjacent. These churches continuing under the inspection and ministry of the bishops in cities, by whose labours and councils they had been engaged to embrace the gospel, grew imperceptibly into ecclesiastical provinces, which the Greeks afterwards called dioceses.” Behold here, then, the first rise of the man of sin, the consequence of transgressing the caveat. These bishops in cities, because, forsooth, they had been benefactors, claimed authority over them ; and although that authority was moderately exercised at first, yet it grew up gradually from less to more, that it issued at last, in the revelation of a certain person whom Bellarmine calls a god on earth, and who, the Scripture says, exalts himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped. Another passage we shall adduce, is from Matt. xxiii. 8. “ But be not ye called Rabbi : for one is your Master, even Christ ; and all ye are brethren. And call no man your father upon the earth, for one is your Father, which is in heaven. Neither be ye called masters : for one is your Master, even Christ.”

“ We have seen this passage quoted in the controversy, but never, in our opinion, fully explained or applied, so as to exhibit the peculiar force of it. It is manifest our Saviour does not mean to prohibit them the use of the word master, or father, as applying either to natural or spiritual generation, in every sense and application of it, for he himself acknowledges Nicodemus a

master in Israel. A different word indeed is used, in the original, but quite synonymous; but he prohibits them to use it, or apply it to any man upon earth, in the same sense as it was applicable to him, and was due to him, as he taught as one having authority, and whose word was to be received and believed, merely because it was his word. And likewise the name father; in this sense it was due to God. Papists transgress this express prohibition, in both instances. The Pope is a master, in the same sense as Jesus Christ is, or he is nothing. The Pope calls himself father, and it must be in the same sense in which God is a father, for he is styled a God on earth, and he calls his votaries,—his sons,—his children.

“Now the apostle says, “ye are all the children of God by faith in Jesus Christ.” In the very same way, therefore, are persons the children of the Pope, viz. by faith in the Pope. “For one is your Master, even Christ, and all ye are brethren.” Now brethren are all equals. Can any thing be more clear and express than this? The whole passage can neither be wrested nor explained away. But to give the supremacy to Peter is a flat contradiction of it. That however has been already shown to be utterly groundless—for Christ did not say that he would build his church upon Petros, a stone, but upon Petra, a rock. Neither did he say that Simon was Petra, a rock, but Petros, a loose moveable stone.

“But Papists have another fort to flee into, in case they should be beaten out of the former, viz. these three words in the last chapter of John’s Gospel “Feed my sheep.” We know that shepherds feed sheep, but that a shepherd should feed shepherds is rather a solecism in pastoral affairs. But let us give them all fair play. Persons of every denomination are Christ’s sheep, and these words give him a commission to feed them. This looks specious. But did not Christ give the very same commission to every one of the apostles, in these words, “Go and preach the gospel?” but to preach the gospel, is to feed the sheep, with the doctrines and ordinances thereof; so that they are one and the same thing in every point of view whatever. And at his final parting with them, did he not give the same extended commission to all of them? Mark xvi. 15. “Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature.” John xx. 21. ‘Then said Jesus to them again, Peace be unto you: as my Father hath sent me, even so send I you. And when he had said this, he breathed on them and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost, whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained.’—Where then is the pre-eminence of Peter? It is by these texts destroyed for ever. The same commission to feed the sheep, and to exercise the keys, is given to them all jointly. But let us examine a

little farther into this matter. Peter had three times denied his Master, by denying that he was his disciple, and the last time, to put an end to all strife, he denied it upon his solemn oath, and declared that he knew nothing at all about him. From that moment, Peter was no more an apostle of Jesus Christ, than Pontius Pilate. Apostleship, supremacy, keys, and all went together. But though Peter had cast off Christ, Christ had not cast him off, and meant to restore him to his apostleship again, and as he had thrice denied him publicly in the face of God, angels, and men, he calls upon him three times, to confess his love to him, and as often renews his commission, "feed my sheep." This it seems Christ thought necessary. There was something very remarkable took place, the third time. It is said Peter was grieved because he said to him the third time, lovest thou me, as if he had doubted of his sincerity. Peter had denied him three times, but had grieved Christ exceedingly the third time, by calling upon God, the searcher of hearts, to attest the truth of his entire ignorance of him, even before his Master's face. Christ therefore drew from him a corresponding appeal to himself as the searcher of hearts, that he really did love him, and Christ says nothing against it. If Judas fell from his apostleship by transgression, as Peter says, as certainly Peter fell from it, by his denial of his Master by oath. The commission, "feed my sheep," restored him to his apostleship, but nothing more; for it was that commission, that made both him, and all the rest, apostles at first. It was building the church upon him, as they pretend, and giving him the keys, that invested him with the supremacy. But not a word is said here, about a rock, or keys, or any thing else. These poor deluded men therefore do greatly err, not knowing the Scriptures.—The next thing is the Pope's infallibility, which they found upon the words of Christ, "And lo I am with you, always, even to the end of the world." The Popes always assumed it; but before the council of Trent some of their writers affirmed it belonged to a general council,—others to a general council, with concurrence of the Pope,—others to the Pope, with concurrence of a general council. Since that period the Pope seems to be exclusively invested with it. Christ has been present with his church since the apostles' days, and will be with his faithful ministers, to the end of the world. But if the Popes lay claim to such inspiration, as to render them infallible, we should expect them all to be men of singularly holy lives and conversations. Such was Peter himself, in the general tenor of his life, and such, he says, were all the inspired men of old. "Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." But have there not been Popes, and not a few of them whose lives were a disgrace to human nature? Have there not been

Popes, who have rescinded the apostolical decrees, and bulls of former Popes, who had every way the same claim to infallibility as themselves? Does not this infallibility prove the fallibility of the Papal chair, themselves being judges? But that such things have taken place, is confirmed by all historians, even by those of their own profession.

“There is one thing, however, that Papists must prove, otherwise their whole system must fall to ruin, “like the baseless fabric of a vision,” viz. that Peter actually exercised this supremacy, and that the rest of the apostles submitted to him, in the exercise of it. But not only can they not do this, but the contrary can be clearly proven against them. Peter, in both his epistles, styles himself simply an apostle of Jesus Christ, not arch-apostle, or prince of the apostles, as Papists call him; directs them to Christ as the living stone, the chief corner stone. Here was the time to put in his claim, if he had any. He, good man, however, never dreamed of any such thing. Nor is there one word, in either of his epistles, or in all that is recorded of him, in the Acts of the Apostles, that savours of it in the least. When he writes to the elders, he says, “The elders which are among you, I exhort, who am also an elder.” Why this notandum, but to show them that he was so far from claiming any higher dignity, than that of apostle, that he considered himself only as a co-presbyter, for so the word is in the original, and that he was going to give them no exhortation, that he could not take to himself as a co-presbyter. And so he exhorts them not to take the oversight of the flock, for filthy lucre, neither as being lords over God’s heritage. Is this the character of the Popish Clergy? It does not appear, therefore, that Peter ever claimed any supremacy over the church. But did the church ever acknowledge it? No: Paul withstood and reproved him to his face, because he was to be blamed. When a point of faith was to be settled, anent circumcision, it was not Peter that was consulted, but the whole apostles and elders, and the decree run in their name, not his, and in the terms of James’ sentence, not his. But what puts the matter beyond all doubt, is, that he actually received and executed a commission from the apostles, at Jerusalem, in their presbyterial capacity, and so acted under their authority. And what greatly confirms the matter is, that he acted jointly in the commission with John, as his equal. For it is said, Acts viii. 14. “Now, when the apostles which were at Jerusalem heard that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent unto them Peter and John.” Now, our Saviour says, whether is greater he that sends, or he that is sent? The answer is an axiom. He that sends is greater than he that is sent.”

THE

# Protestant,

No. C.

---

SATURDAY, JUNE 10th, 1820.

---

ON the subject of the alleged supremacy of the apostle Peter, I have little to add, to what has been so well said by my judicious correspondent J. C. It must be evident, to all who understand our Lord's words, Mat. xvi. 18. that whatever honour he meant to confer upon that Apostle, he did not constitute him the rock, or foundation, on which he was to build his church. Peter was no more fit to be such a foundation, than he was to create the universe : and it is the avowed doctrine of St. Augustine, one of Rome's greatest oracles, that Christ did not promise to build his church upon Peter, but upon himself, the rock which Peter had confessed. Augustine writes as follows : " Thou art Peter, and upon the rock which thou hast confessed, upon this rock which thou hast known, saying, ' Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God,' will I build my church : I will build thee upon me, not me upon thee." *August. de Verb. Domin. Serm. 13.* See *Via Tuta and Via Devia*, p. 167. It must be admitted that this great divine was not a thorough-bred Papist. It was some ages after his time before the man of sin came to maturity, or that the Pope was declared universal bishop. Augustine was not fully initiated into the doctrine of Peter's supremacy. He did not foresee the use which was afterwards to be made of such a pretext, by the bishops of Rome ; and accordingly, taking the words of Christ in their plain simple meaning, he gave them the true Protestant interpretation, that Christ himself, and not Peter, was the rock on which he would build his church.

Augustine, however, is one of the fathers of the church, whose unanimous consent is pleaded by Papists, as establishing all their nostrums. I consider the authority of this father, and of all the rest, with regard to the meaning of any passage of Scripture, as no greater than that of any divine of the present age ; but when I can produce such an authority against the church of Rome, it is of great weight upon her own principles. I would tell the Pope, if he would admit me to an audience—

"You teach that Peter is the rock on which Christ built his church; that you are Peter's successor; that you consider the whole weight of the church as resting upon you; and that this is according to the unanimous consent of the fathers of the church from the earliest ages." In reply to the last assertion I would say: "Here is one of the greatest fathers of the church, one who presides to this day over all your divines, even as St. Crispin presides over cobblers, and St. Gallus over sheep and geese, (see vol. I. p. 359.) who plainly declares that Christ did not build his church upon the stone πέτρος, but upon himself (τῇ πετρᾷ) the rock." I have many weightier reasons for rejecting the whole doctrine maintained by the church of Rome, on this point; but I think the above is enough to show, that she cannot plead on her behalf the unanimous consent of the fathers.

Dr. Campbell of Aberdeen, in his Lectures on Ecclesiastical History, (Lect. v.) has conceded a good deal, on the subject of Peter's primacy, at least, among the apostles; though he by no means concedes the point of supremacy; and it appears to me, that even on the point of primacy, the celebrated critic has conceded more than enough. There is no evidence in the New Testament, either that Christ appointed that apostle, or that his brethren chose him to preside over them, or that the whole of them, even upon the day of Pentecost, were not upon a footing of perfect equality; nay, from the circumstance of Peter's being appointed by the rest, as observed by my correspondent J. C. to go upon a mission to Samaria, it is very evident that the other apostles did not look upon him as their superior, from whom they were to receive instructions, seeing they actually gave him instructions, at least an appointment, to go upon a certain work, in the service of their common Master.

It is true that Peter makes a more conspicuous appearance in the evangelical narrative, during our Lord's personal ministry, than any other of the apostles; and his name is first mentioned as engaged in the great work of the day of Pentecost. But there is nothing of supremacy, or even of primacy, in this. In every company, however small, some one will be found more fit for business than the rest; some one, perhaps, more forward, more courageous, and more ready to engage in any enterprize; some one to whom the rest of the company will insensibly give place, or tacitly concede a temporary precedence, merely for the sake of present convenience, or for the attainment of some object which may be better effected by one hand, or one mouth, or one pen, than if a dozen of such instruments were employed about it, all at once. I have often seen in the affairs of this world—in public business—in the management of public charities, for instance, that the work falls almost naturally into the hands of two

or three individuals, whose aptness for such business is known and acknowledged; and of these two or three, one will be looked up to, as better qualified to be a leader or president, than either of the other two. Providence has thus wisely ordered that human talents should find their level, and have scope for exercise; and if there were not a voluntary concession of precedence, in favour of those whose personal endowments qualified them for it, the business of the world could not be carried on, with any degree of regularity.

The same remarks apply to religious society. Suppose a few Christians, entire strangers to one another, were to meet in a desert. Suppose them to enter into conversation upon the subject of the common salvation, they would not have talked for an hour, till some one would engage the affections of the rest so far, as to induce them to request him to take the lead, and preside in their worship, while they continued together, and be their mouth in offering up their united prayers and thanksgivings, to the God of their salvation. This would not give the distinguished individual, a primacy or superiority over the rest. The very circumstance of his being greatest in spiritual gifts, would teach him to be the servant of all, and to consider himself the least of all.

In the small company of the apostles, Peter appears to have been such a character, as I have here described. He was not the first of them who became Christ's followers. He was not the most distinguished by his Master's private friendship, for this honour was conferred on John, perhaps in a still greater degree upon Lazarus, and his sisters; but Peter was a man of a bold and decided character; of a generous and ardent temper, rather too much inclined to what is called forwardness. From the more retiring disposition of the rest, they would naturally fall into the rear of him when they had any communication to make to their Master; and as he sometimes spoke to Christ in the name of all the apostles, Christ would of course reply more directly to him. This precedence, however, was merely personal, not official, as the church of Rome would have it. It arose out of the natural or spiritual endowments of the *man*, but conferred no superiority of *office*. If Christ had appointed Peter to the primacy, or if, in virtue of his qualifications for rule over the other apostles, they had chosen him to be perpetual president, he would then indeed have had an official superiority, but nothing of this kind appears from the New Testament. Though we admit that he presided in the first meeting of the church in Jerusalem, when there were present a hundred and twenty disciples, including the eleven apostles, this does not imply that he was superior to the other ten, any more than a minister preaching to a congregation, in which there are other ministers, would

imply that the preacher was superior in office, to his brethren in the ministry. It is necessary for the sake of order, in every meeting for worship or business, that some one preside ; to lead the worship, or state the business of the meeting. Peter seems to have done so, in the meeting above referred to, when the business was to elect an apostle in the room of Judas ; but Peter did no more than what any other of the apostles might have done. He had no superiority but that of order for the time, and which any other of the apostles might have, the next time they met. Ministers in the church of Scotland have no superiority over one another. The Moderator of the General Assembly is, indeed, officially above them all while the Assembly sits ; but immediately on the dissolution of that venerable body, he returns to a station of perfect equality with his brethren.

It does not appear that Peter presided in the meeting of the church in Jerusalem, with the apostles and elders, of which an account is given in the fifteenth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles. It is not indeed said explicitly who presided there ; but the probability is that it was James. After a good deal of discussion, Peter stood up, and stated some plain facts ; and then declared his judgment upon the question before them. He was followed on the same side by Barnabas and Paul : after which James performed the part of president, by summing up the substance of what had been narrated, especially by Peter ; showing its conformity with old Testament prophecy ; and proposing to the whole body the sentence which he thought should be pronounced. The brethren were satisfied, the thing was unanimously agreed to, and the question was set at rest. In the whole passage there is not a word of superiority claimed by, or conceded to Peter, by the other apostles, except it be the honour of having been chosen by God to preach the gospel to the Gentiles ; an honour which was afterwards more abundantly conferred upon the apostle Paul.

From the history of the last mentioned apostle, and from the epistles which he wrote, it is very evident, that he at least acknowledged no superiority in Peter. Had Peter been then acknowledged as the vicar of Christ on earth, the regular way would have been for Paul to go to him, and receive his commission from his hands. But Paul tells us plainly, that this was not the case ; for the gospel which he preached, he received not from man, neither was he taught it, but by the revelation of Jesus Christ. Gal. i. 12. He did not hold his commission at second hand from Peter, as all the Popish priests hold theirs of the Pope ; and he adds in the second chapter of the same epistle, that not even the three apostles, James, and Cephas, (i. e. Peter) and John, who had been distinguished above all the rest



on several occasions, particularly on the mount of transfiguration, added any thing to his authority as an apostle of Christ. These three, indeed, he says, seemed to be pillars, that is, leading men even among the apostles; but jointly or severally, he concedes to them no superiority over himself. Certainly then, he was not a believer in the Popish doctrine, that Peter was the vicar of Christ, and prince of the apostles.

It seems to have been admitted, that in the apostolic College, as it is called, there was a difference of rank, arising solely from the endowments, or gifts of the Holy Ghost, who divided to every one according to his own will. All the apostles were vessels meet for their Master's use; but some were honoured more than others. Thus we find that Paul speaks of some whom he calls the very chiefest apostles (2 Cor. xi. 5.) which implies that there was a distinction among them; but then he tells us that he was not a whit behind the *very chiefest*. Certainly, then, he acknowledged no superiority on the part of Peter, who, though a chief apostle, and a pillar, had no pre-eminence above him, who was as one born out of due time.

In the same chapter, (Gal. ii.) we have a melancholy evidence of the fact, that Peter was not the rock on which the church was built; but at best, only a moveable stone, by his dissimulation with the Gentile converts, in order to keep on good terms with the Jewish ones. For this, Paul reprov'd him to his face, because he was to be blamed. Paul does not say that he approached him, as the vicar of Christ, with a humble representation and remonstrance, as would have been proper, had Peter been his ecclesiastical superior; but as one upon a footing of equality, and as one Christian would admonish another, when he is to blame, Paul reprov'd his brother apostle for the grievous error into which he had fallen, which was not only disheartening to the believing Gentiles, but which actually had the effect of seducing Barnabas, a most faithful disciple, from the simplicity of the gospel. See this subject treated more at length in vol. I. No. vii.

Upon the same passage of scripture, Mat. xvi. 18, 19. the church of Rome builds this other error, that Peter exclusively was entrusted with the keys of the kingdom of heaven. Christ did indeed promise them to him, but not to him alone; any more than he described the blessedness of him alone, when he said "Blessed art thou Simon Barjona, for flesh and blood hath not revealed it to thee, but my Father who is in heaven." Christ had put a question to *all* the Apostles, "Whom say *ye* that I am?" Peter answered for them, "thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." Christ, on receiving this answer, pronounced the blessing as above, which evidently extended to the other apostles to whom the same truth was revealed, and who

concurred in the same confession. We might then as well say, that Christ blessed Peter exclusively of the rest, as that he promised the keys to him alone. But the matter is put beyond a doubt, by the declared purpose for which the keys were to be given; "Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven." This was a promise to Peter, that he should have power and authority (for of this the keys were a symbol,) in the kingdom of heaven; that is, the New Testament church. But that Christ's promise extended to the other apostles, is evident from the fulfilment of it. When the appointed time arrived, that is, when he was about to ascend to heaven, he conferred this power on the eleven apostles without distinction. Binding and loosing in the kingdom of heaven, are terms of precisely the same import as remitting and retaining sins. They relate to the authority which Christ conferred on his inspired apostles, with regard to doctrine, worship, government, and discipline in the church. It is certain, then, that Christ conferred this upon all the apostles. Thus we read, John xx. 21—23. "Then said Jesus unto them again, peace be unto you; as my Father hath sent me, even so send I you. And when he had said this, he breathed on them, and saith unto them, receive ye the Holy Ghost. Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained." Here there is no superiority or supremacy conferred upon Peter. He stands upon a perfect equality with his brethren in the apostleship; and as for what Christ afterwards said to him, "Feed my lambs, feed my sheep," it implied no more than what was required of the rest of the apostles, and what they were all alike empowered to do, by the divine commission, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature."

Much has been said and written about the power of the keys; that is, who is entitled to exercise authority in the church of Christ? and I am inclined to think, that the only satisfactory answer that can be given to the question, is, that the power still remains, where Christ originally placed it; that is, in the hands of the apostles, who were his accredited ambassadors. Christ himself is Lord and King in his own church. He hath the key of David. This symbol of authority is laid on his shoulder. "He openeth, and no man can shut; he shutteth, and no man can open." "The Father hath given him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as he hath given him." But when Christ went to heaven, he left his apostles to act and speak on his behalf; and he invested them with such authority, that he who heard them, heard him, and he who despised them, despised him. As the Father sent him, so he sent them. This was connected with the promise and gift of

the Holy Ghost, which was conferred on the day of Pentecost, in virtue of which, they became infallible teachers and rulers in the kingdom of heaven. What the apostles did and taught under this divine influence, was divine teaching and divine operation. The Holy Ghost brought to their remembrance, and enabled them to state with infallible precision, the things which Christ himself had told them ; and the Divine Spirit also instructed them with regard to all the other matters, which were necessary for the edification and government of the church ; which things Christ himself only "*be-gan* to do and teach," (Acts i. 1.) while he was personally with them ; reserving the finishing lessons, to be imparted by the Holy Ghost, of whom he said, "when he is come, he will teach you all things and bring all things to your remembrance."

Now Christ himself having the key of David ; that is, sovereign authority in the church, was pleased to devolve the exercise of that authority upon his apostles ; but only in connexion with their receiving the Holy Ghost ; so that all that they did, and spoke, and wrote, should be under his divine inspiration. Authority exercised under such influence, was nothing less than divine authority. Such was that which the apostles exercised in their personal ministry in the churches which they planted ; and having committed to writing what the Holy Ghost dictated for the government, instruction, and edification of the church in all future ages, their writings are the only authoritative rule, by which the conduct of Christians and Christian churches, is to be regulated. Christ gave authority to them, and they only of the human race have been honoured to carry the keys of the kingdom of heaven.

I am perfectly aware, that a claim of right to exercise the power conferred by the gift of the keys, is made by church rulers of all denominations of Christians ; and I think nothing that I have said, will be considered as interfering with such right, if it be kept in its proper place. In every church, however great, or however small, there must be the power of binding and loosing ; of receiving and excluding members ; of administering divine ordinances, whether of doctrine, worship, government, or discipline ; but whether this power be lodged in the hands of many, or in the hands of few, it is only ministerial. It is, in a subordinate sense, making use of the keys which Christ gave to the apostles ; but if the eye and the hand of Him who inspired the apostles, do not guide every turning of the keys, they will be used not for the edification, but for the destruction of the church. In plain English, the written word of the apostles is the only rule, by which the power of Christ is to be administered in his church ; and therefore, properly speaking, they only are the holders of the keys of the kingdom of heaven ; and he would not have intrusted such power even to them, had he not ordained

the exercise of it to be under the immediate guidance of the Holy Ghost, so that they should be infallibly secured against falling into error, in the exercise of the authority which he committed to them. There are many who despise church authority; and certainly the usurpations of the church of Rome, are calculated to make men both dread and despise it; but all lawful authority in the church, is the authority of Christ; and he who despises it must bear his own burden.

It is worthy of remark, that in the very passage, (Mat. xviii. 15—18.) which churches and church-rulers plead as their warrant, for exercising the power of the keys, that power is expressly referred to the apostles. Offenders, after private means for their recovery to repentance have been used in vain, are to be reported to the church: and if any one shall refuse to hear the church, it is commanded that he be considered as a heathen and a publican; that is, that he be put away from their communion; and it is added, not absolutely or unconditionally, what the church shall do, shall be confirmed; but “Verily I say unto you (my apostles) whatsoever ye shall bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven.” The confirmation in heaven, therefore, of the sentence of any church upon earth, depends upon its being a sentence of the apostles. It must be a binding or a loosing; a retaining or a remitting of sins, according to their word; otherwise it is of no authority whatever in heaven, though it should have the sanction of all the councils and all the congregations in the world.

In all such discussions as these, we ought to remember, that Christ himself hath the key of David. This prerogative he claimed for himself, after Peter was dead; (Rev. iii. 7.) and he holds the key in his own hand still. He has the entire disposal of the treasures of everlasting life. “It pleased the Father that in him all fulness should dwell;” and this fulness is dispensed, according to the testimony of his apostles, to all who apply to him. “Out of his fulness they themselves had received, even grace upon grace;” that is, favour upon favour, more than they could express: and what they saw, and heard, and contemplated of the word of life (1 John i. 1—3) they have declared to us, that we also may have fellowship with them, whose fellowship truly is with the Father, and with his Son, Jesus Christ. But supposing the key of such treasures to be transferred to the Pope of Rome, the pretended successor of Peter, the church would be left in dependence upon a fellow creature, upon a broken reed that could afford no help, but would wound and disappoint him who should be so foolish as to lean upon it.

THE  
**Protestant,**

No. CI.

---

SATURDAY, JUNE 17th, 1820.

---

A GRAVE author of the Church of Rome derives the supremacy of Peter from something like a pun, in the new name Cephas, which Christ gave him. This word, pronounced Kephaz, which signifies a stone, resembles a Greek word which signifies head ; therefore, he will have it, that Peter is the head of the church. “ For therefore,” says Optatus of Milevis, in Africa, “ Christ gave him the cognomination of Cephas, ἀπὸ τῆς κεφαλῆς, to show that St. Peter was the visible head of the Catholic church.” In Scotland, there are several families of the name of Roy, which is almost the same as *Roi*, which, in French, signifies king ; *ergo*, all the Roys must be kings ; and the M’Ilroys, or Macs-les-rois, must be princes of the blood royal. I am afraid the herald’s office would not confirm this doctrine ; but I am sure it is as good as that of the African divine, who finds the supremacy of Peter in the resemblance between the Greek word κεφαλή, ‘ the head,’ and the Syriac word Cephas, ‘ a stone.’ I find the words of the above named Optatus in Jeremy Taylor’s Discourse of the Liberty of Prophesying, edit. 1647, page 127.

The first thing which Papists wish us to believe concerning Peter, is, that he was the vicar of Christ, and prince of the apostles ; the next is, that he was the founder and first bishop of the church of Rome. Having shown that he was not, by divine authority, invested with the former office, I come now to show that he never held the latter ; at least, that there is no evidence of his having done so ; and, in a matter of so much importance, we ought to have the most positive evidence. In fact, the whole system of Popery rests upon the assumption that Peter was the first bishop of Rome, that is, the first Pope ; and if this cannot be proved, and it certainly has never yet been proved, the whole fabric must fall to the ground.

It is my wish to do justice to this, as well as to every other subject that comes under my review ; and, therefore, I shall give

here the entire chapter, or "table of St. Peter," as it is laid down by the translators of the Rhemish New Testament, omitting the years of the Roman emperors, and of the ascension, and noting only the common Christian era.

"Anno Domini, 34. Peter causeth the disciples to proceed to the election of another apostle in Judas' room, Acts i. Receiveth, with the rest, the gifts of the Holy Ghost, on Whitsunday. He made the first sermon, and converted 3000, Acts ii. He cureth one born lame; preacheth Christ and penance to the Jews; so that 5000 believed, Acts iii. and iv. He is imprisoned, released again, threatened, and commanded to preach no more; but he, with John, answereth, that they must obey God more than man, Acts iv. He striketh dead, with a word, Ananias and Sapphira, for sacrilege, Acts v. He is sent with John to Samaria, to confirm the newly baptized, where he reproveth Simon Magus, Acts viii.

"A. D. 35. He healeth Eneas at Lydda, and raiseth Tabitha from death, at Joppa, Acts ix. He is warned and taught by a vision, to preach to Cornelius, a Gentile, Acts x. He defendeth his receiving of the Gentiles, Acts xi.; and records, (Acts xv.) that God called the first Gentiles by his ministry; so that Paul's first preaching to them, and his going to Arabia, must be after this. *See St. Chryst. in Act. No. 22, Euseb. lib. ii. cap. 3.*"

"A. D. 36. He continueth preaching in divers parts of Jewry, and the provinces adjoining. About two years after this, St. Paul visiteth him in Jerusalem, Gal. i. He preacheth in Syria, and the provinces of Asia Minor, Bithynia, Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, ordaining bishops and priests in divers places. 1 *Pet. i. Niceph. lib. ii. c. 35. Platina in Petro.*

"A. D. 39. He goeth to Antioch, and preacheth there, and maketh that his seat; yet not remaining there continually, but, for the affairs of the church, departing thence sometimes to Jerusalem, sometimes to other places. *Hiero. in Catalogo. Ignat. ad Magnesianos.* At Jerusalem he is cast into prison, after the putting of St. James to death, by the commandment of Herod. He is prayed for by the whole church, and delivered out of prison by an angel, Acts xii.

"A. D. 44. Avoiding the fury of Herod, he leaveth Jewry again. He appointeth Enodius bishop of Antioch. *Euseb. in Chron. and lib. li. 3. cap. 16. Suidas Ignat. ad Antiochen.* And passing by Corinth, HE CAME TO ROME, to convince Simon Magus. *Hiero. in Catalogo. Euseb. lib. ii. c. 12, 13, 24 Concil. tom. i.* He approveth and declareth the gospel of St. Mark to be canonical. *Hiero. in Catalogo. Euseb. lib. ii. cap. 14.* Having founded the church of Rome, and planted his

apostolical seat there, afterwards absent from the city, (either expelled thence, with other Jews, *Cornel. Tacit. in Claudio*; or rather, according to the office of his apostleship, leaving it for a time,) he visited other churches, and came to Jerusalem again, using, both in his absence and presence, Linus and Cle-tus for his co-adjutors. *Tom. 2. Concil. p. 656. Epiph. tom. 2. Hiero. 27.*

“A. D. 51. He holdeth the first council, Acts xv. He is reprehended at Antioch by St. Paul, Galat. ii. except that difference fell before the council, as some think, *August. op. 19.* He returneth to Rome again. The Roman faith, by his diligence, now made famous through the world. Rom. i. and xv. *Theodoret in xvi. Rom.* Thence he writeth his first epistle. 1 Pet. v. *Euseb. lib. ii. cap. 14. Hiero. in Catalogo.* He sendeth St. Mark to Alexandria, and others to plant the faith in divers parts of the world, *Grego. lib. v. cap. 60. and lib. vi. ep. 37. Nicepho. lib. ii. c. 35.* He writeth his second epistle, a little before his death, which Christ revealed to him to be at hand, 2 Pet. i. He taketh order for his successor.

“A. D. 70. He was finally crucified at Rome. *See the last Annot. John c. 21.*”

The annotation here referred to is as follows:—“Another shall gird thee. He prophesieth of Peter’s martyrdom, and of the kind of death which he should suffer, that was crucifying; which the heretics, fearing that it were a step to prove that he was martyred in Rome, deny; whereas the fathers, and ancient writers, are as plain in this, as that he was at Rome.” Then follows a reference to Origen, as quoted by Eusebius, and Eusebius himself, &c. &c., which may be allowed to make it as certain that Peter was crucified in Rome, as that he was bishop of Rome, or that he ever saw Rome, both of which yet remain to be proved; for nothing that these fathers have written tends to prove the fact of the apostle’s having been there, except that there was a vague tradition on the subject, which is surely a foundation extremely slender for building such a fabric as the Church of Rome professes to build upon it.

If Peter ever was in Rome, he would have been there a person of much less consequence than the youngest dissenting minister is, at present, in Glasgow, not to speak of doctors in divinity. We know that when Paul was brought to that great city, with a military escort, and under all the solemnity of an appeal to Cesar, he was suffered to live for two years in a hired apartment, without being an object of public attention, except to such Jews and others as chose to call upon him. Nay, he was in such obscurity, that it required very diligent search to

And out where he lodged, see 2 Tim. i. 17. Now, had Peter found his way to the same city, bringing no other news than the news of salvation by Jesus Christ, he would have been considered a person of no more consequence than any other wandering Jew, who might come to Rome upon business of his own. If he had proceeded to perform miracles, he would probably have engaged public notice. His miracles would, it is likely, have been ascribed, by the heathen writers, to magic; and the fact of such miracles having been performed, to whatever power they were ascribed, would probably have been attested by some eye-witness; and we should have had some record of it by some of the writers of the day. We cannot even produce this evidence of Paul's having been in Rome; and we know the fact of his having been there from no other source than the apostolic record. We have not this evidence of Peter's having been there; and, therefore, we cannot reasonably be called upon to believe it; much less to build a system of religion upon it, as is done by the Church of Rome.

On such a subject, the vague tradition of fathers, who lived hundreds of years after the apostolic age, is of no authority whatever. I adhere to my position, that the apostle Peter was not in the esteem of the Roman empire, or even of Roman citizens,—a person of such consequence, as to engage the particular notice of the historians of the day. There was, therefore, no record of his travels and labours preserved, except what was taken by his Christian brethren, and preserved in the New Testament. We know how difficult it is to come at the truth, with regard to persons who lived within a few years of our own time, especially if no written memorial of them has been preserved. It must have been much more difficult in the first ages of the Christian era, and in the disturbed state of the Roman empire, to ascertain any fact with regard to the life and death of men who were so generally abhorred, and so cruelly persecuted, as the Christians were, except what they and their contemporaries had written. Though the writers who speak of Peter's having been at Rome, had lived within fifty years of his death, they would not have been able to ascertain the fact without great difficulty; surely then, where two or three hundred years had elapsed, it must have been impossible to know any thing of the matter, with certainty. There were few authors, and no printing, in those days. Real facts, with regard to a man politically so insignificant, could only be transmitted from mouth to mouth, by persons still more obscure; and, by the time of Origen or Eusebius, no man could tell what was true and what was not, except what the Christian churches had preserved, as the authentic testimony of eye and ear wit-



nesses ; that is, just what we have in the New Testament, and nothing more can be depended on.

Besides, the traditionary account of Peter's having been in Rome is not consistent with itself, or with the authentic account of him which we have in the New Testament. "Concerning the time of his coming to Rome," says Fulke, "the ancient writers do not agree. Eusebius saith, it was in the time of Claudius ; but by Hierom, who saith he sat there twenty-five years, until the last year of Nero, it must follow, that he came thither the second or third of Claudius ; yet Damasus saith, he came to Rome in the beginning of Nero's empire, and sat there twenty-five years ; whereas, Nero reigned but fourteen years. He saith also, that his disputation with Simon Magus was in the presence of Nero the emperor. Eusebius reporteth it under Claudius. Anterius, bishop of Rome, (as Nicephorus testifieth) did write that Peter was translated from Antioch to Rome, and from thence he passed to Alexandria, because he might more profit the church there." These are all matters of mere hearsay, reported hundreds of years after Peter's death, and, therefore, entitled to no credit at all. Had Peter been twenty-five years bishop of Rome, he must have been sitting there at the time that Paul was there, or, at least, when he addressed an epistle to the church in Rome ; and yet it is a fact, that in his epistle to the believers in Rome, and in all his epistles written from Rome, Paul makes no mention of his brother apostle ; but he does make mention of some things that would have been most disgraceful to Peter, had he been there. No salutations were sent to Peter by Paul, in his epistle to the Romans, while he pays this respect to a host of meaner persons, chapter xvi. And when he was a prisoner in Rome, he sent no salutations from Peter to any of the churches or individuals to whom he wrote ; surely, then, Peter was not there. Paul says, "at his first appearance, no man stood by him, but that all forsook him." Surely, if Peter had been in Rome, he would not have deserted his brother in his affliction, and when brought before Nero to answer with his life. The church in Rome, of which Paul had heard so many good things, before he saw them, had declined so much by the time he came to them, that he spake as if there had not been one among them in whom he could confide. "All men," says he, "seek their own, not the things which are Christ's," Phil. ii. 21. He would surely have made the exception of Peter, had he been there.

The fact seems to be, that the tradition of Peter's having been at Rome, and his coming there to contend with Simon Magus, seems to have arisen out of a confused account of what took place in Samaria, Acts viii., in which it is recorded, that the

apostle had a sorcerer to contend with. It was easy, after the lapse of two or three hundred years, to transfer the scene of this contest to Rome; especially when the church in the imperial city began to put forward her claim to be the mother and mistress of all churches. Then it appeared to be a matter of great importance to have it believed that the highly honoured apostle, Peter, was their founder, and first bishop. The slightest surmise would eagerly be caught hold of, and would be repeated from mouth to mouth, and from age to age, until the thing became fixed in the minds of all, as an undoubted truth. The meaning which was unjustly affixed to Christ's words, "I give thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven," as addressed in the first instance to Peter, served to confirm the delusion.

One cannot help reflecting, with some degree of melancholy, on the low and contemptible ideas which Papists must have of the office and work of the apostles. Peter, according to them, came to Rome for the express purpose of opposing Simon Magus, as if this had been an object worthy of so long a journey, by so great a man. When such deceivers, as Simon and Elymas, came in the way of apostles, we are informed how they dealt with them; but we never read of apostles going out of their way to seek for them. These sorcerers were indeed enemies of the truth, but the apostles had as great enemies as they to contend with, in the hearts of all the men whom they addressed, until they were subdued by the gospel. It would have been matter of great triumph for Satan, if he had got all the apostles set a hunting after jugglers, and to neglect the work of preaching the gospel to sinners.

It might be admitted, were there the slightest evidence of it, that Peter, in the course of his journey, came to Rome; but Papists would gain nothing by the admission, unless it be farther shown that he was bishop of Rome, of which there is not the shadow of evidence. Nay, I maintain that his holding such an office would have been inconsistent with the higher office of an apostle, with which we are sure he was invested by Christ himself. The bishop of any one church has the official oversight of that church, but not of any other. Had Peter been chosen by the church in Rome to be their bishop, he could not have accepted of the office, without laying down that which he had received from his Lord and Master, and which made it imperative upon him to go into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature. Upon Paul came daily the care of all the churches, especially of the Gentiles, which he had planted; and upon Peter, no doubt, came the care of all the churches, especially among the Jews, of which he was entrusted with the more immediate charge, as seems to have been intimated by the opening of Providence, and the suggestion of the Holy Ghost, and acquiesced in, by the two apostles themselves, Gal. ii. 7. The apostles doubtless were bishops in the highest sense of

the word, that is, they were overseers or pastors of Christ's flock, wherever they were; but the oversight, or pastoral charge of particular churches, they committed to men who were also bishops, but in an inferior sense. It was part of the work of apostles to ordain ordinary bishops; and this power seems also to have been conferred on the evangelists Timothy and Titus; but the apostles themselves, so far as appears, never consented to become bishops of particular churches. Yet, wherever they had their residence, at any time, the bishops of the churches who had access to them, and the churches themselves, would, no doubt, look up to them as their spiritual fathers, and overseers in the Lord. Thus we may admit, that James in Jerusalem, and Peter in Antioch, and Paul in Rome, and John in Ephesus, exercised episcopal authority in these places, without supposing them officially attached to them as their *peculiar* charge. Who first preached the gospel in Rome, and planted the church there, we do not know; but it does not appear that ever they were favoured with the presence of any of the apostles, except Paul; and it is not even pretended that he was their bishop. Some of the fathers, indeed, join him with Peter, in laying the foundation of the Church of Rome; though it is certain, from Rom. i. 10, 11. that there was a church there before Paul came to it.

Christ's words to Peter, as explained by John, chap. xxi. 18, 19. lead us to believe that Peter must have suffered martyrdom; but where, or in what manner, we know nothing with certainty. The apostles fell one by one, when it pleased their Master to call them from labour and suffering, to rest and glory with himself; but it does not appear that any of them appointed successors; indeed, that was a power that did not belong to them. Each of them had received his commission directly from Christ, and to Him he resigned it, along with his life. They left bishops or pastors to oversee the churches, and feed the flock of Christ, after their death, and to the end of the world; and they left their writings, as the infallible rule of faith and manners to all their churches, and to all the pastors. But their office, as apostles, they did not leave to others; and, therefore, in this sense, they had no successors.

When James, and Peter, and Paul, were taken away by violent death, and when several others of the apostles were probably removed in the same way, it is reasonable to suppose that such of the original twelve as survived, would be looked up to as possessing the authority of all the rest. The apostle John, we have reason to think, outlived Peter by a number of years. Had Peter then been prince of the apostles, and vicar of Christ, it might have been expected, that, had he bequeathed his power to any one, it would have been to this beloved disciple. This,

however, is not so much as pretended ; but it is pretended that Peter appointed Clement and Linus to be his co-adjutors, and one of them, it is not certain which, to be his successor in the see of Rome. Now this would have been very irregular procedure, had there been any truth in it. Who was Clement, and who was Linus, that either of them should have been promoted over the head of the apostle John, to be Christ's vicar on earth, and universal bishop ?

“ It is no way likely,” says Dr. Jeremy Taylor, “ that a private person should skip over the head of an apostle ; or why should his successors at Rome enjoy the benefit of it more than his successors at Antioch, since that he was at Antioch, and preached there, we have a divine authority ; but that he did so at Rome, at most, we have but a human ; and if it be replied, that because he died at Rome, it was argument enough that there his successors were to inherit his privilege ; this, besides that at most it is but one little degree of probability, and not of strength sufficient to support an article of faith ; it makes that the great divine right at Rome, and the apostolical presidency, was so contingent and fallible as to depend upon the decree of Nero ; and if he had sent him to Antioch, there to have suffered martyrdom, the bishops of that town had been head of the Catholic church.” *Liberty of Prophesying, page 134.* Had such a headship been really conferred upon Peter, and had there been any credible evidence of the fact, it would not have been invalidated on account of its having been effected by a decree of Nero, because this might have been part of the plan ordained by Providence for carrying the thing into effect ; even as it was by the determinate council and foreknowledge of God, that Christ was, by wicked hands, crucified and slain. But then the fact remains to be proved. It remains to be shown that Peter was divinely appointed head of the Catholic church. While this point remains unproved, we have a very good right to say, that had Nero sent Peter to be put to death at Antioch, or any where else, and had it been appointed that the place of his death should give name to his see, and to the church in all time coming, then it depended upon the man who commanded his death, whether Rome, or Antioch, or Jerusalem, should thenceforth give name to the Catholic church.

These things are extremely trifling, but we must sometimes descend to trifles, when we engage with children, and even with the fathers of Rome, who cannot rise above childish things. In short, there is no sensible man who would venture the value of a new hat upon the proof of the fact that Peter was bishop of Rome ; and yet Papists are so simple as to venture their all, both for time and eternity, upon it.

THE  
**Protestant,**

No. CII.

---

SATURDAY, JUNE 24th, 1820.

---

**I**N the evangelical history, Peter's name is usually, if not uniformly, mentioned first, when the names of the apostles are given ; and in one instance (Mat. x. 2.) Peter is called the first ; but for any thing we know, this may have been because he was the oldest man. It is impossible to give a list of names without putting one before another, and some one first, unless it be in the form of a round robin ; and the order in which they are first written will generally be that in which they are repeated. This circumstance appears a very slender ground for building a great system upon ; but Popish authors, and especially Bishop Hay, lay great stress upon it. Now, if Peter was vicar of Christ at all, he could not properly be acknowledged such, till after Christ had left the earth. It was when Christ was about to ascend to heaven, that he conferred upon his apostles all the authority which he meant them to exercise ; and he instructed them to wait for the promised effusion of the Holy Spirit, before they entered upon their work. Peter's headship could not properly commence sooner than Christ's ascension ; and yet it so happens that after this, he is not always mentioned first when apostles are spoken of. In 1 Cor. i. 12. and iii. 22. he is mentioned the last of three,—Paul, Apollos, and Cephas ; thus, one who was not an apostle at all in the original sense of the word, is put before Peter ; and in 1 Cor. iii. 5. he is omitted altogether ; and only Paul and Apollos are mentioned, though the subject under discussion is the same as that in which his name has been mentioned. Paul mentions himself before Peter, Gal. ii. 7. and in the 9th verse of the same chapter, the arrangement is, James, Cephas, and John, which would never have been the case, had Peter been the Pope of the day. No man writing from Rome at present would say, Cardinal Gonsalvi and the Pope ; he would doubtless mention the Pope first, if he had a particle of good manners in him ; and had Peter been looked

up to by the other apostles as their holy father, Paul would doubtless have respected, and spoken of him as such, for no man understood better, or taught more plainly, the duty of giving honour to whom honour is due.

“St. Peter,” says Bishop Hay, in his *Sincere Christian*, vol. i. chap. xii. “acted in this supreme capacity as head of the church, both when he called the brethren to deliberate about choosing one in the place of Judas, Acts i. and also when he gave the definitive sentence in the council of Jerusalem, after there had been much disputing, Acts xv. 7.; but when he had spoken, all the multitude held their peace, ver. 12. and submitted to his decision, as did also St. James, who assented to, and confirmed what he had said.” The right reverend Bishop must have been aware, that he was writing this for persons who had not Bibles, or who were not allowed to look into them, or who would not be at the pains to look into them, if they had them. He represents the whole multitude’s holding their peace when Peter had spoken, as an implicit acquiescence in what he had said, and submission to him. Had it been so, it would have been right, seeing he was an inspired apostle; but in point of fact it was not so. The people held their peace, or kept silence, not as a sign of submission to Peter, but that they might give audience to Barnabas and Paul, and hear what they had to say, which would have been unnecessary had they considered Peter as having settled the controversy by his *ipse dixit*.

It is true that James assented to, and confirmed what Peter had said. He confirmed it by a quotation from the Old Testament, which was always reckoned a satisfactory confirmation, by believers who were originally Jews; but it is not true that all the people submitted to Peter’s decision, for neither the proposal nor the decision were his. The proposal was that of James, who said, *My sentence is*, &c.; and the thing was agreeable to “the apostles and elders, with the whole church,” ver. 22. but the decision itself was that of the Holy Ghost, on whose testimony it was founded, and by whose authority it was announced. “It seemed good unto the Holy Ghost and to us,” ver. 28. is the language in which the decision is addressed to the church in Antioch. The decree, therefore, as it is called, had all the authority of the Holy Ghost speaking in the Old Testament scriptures, and also speaking by the mouth of apostles who were inspired and infallible interpreters of the Old Testament. It was a decision from which no one could dissent without rebellion against God. On this point I suppose all Protestants, at least, are agreed; and it is not necessary that I should enter upon the discussion of minor points, on which some of the most enlightened of them differ in opinion; and on which there is much

said on all sides. It is enough that I have shown that the decision in this case was not that of Peter ; and that, therefore, the circumstance furnishes no evidence of his supremacy.

"Again," says Bishop Hay, "the writers of Christianity, and holy fathers in every age, have always attested it as a truth revealed by God, that Jesus Christ did constitute St. Peter prince of the apostles, and visible head of the church." Vol. i. chap. xii. The Bishop does not say to whom this was revealed ; and as we have no authentic, or even credible revelation later than that of "St. John the Divine," we cannot reasonably be required to believe any thing that comes after him, in the form of a revelation to any other divine or father of the church. But it is not true, that holy fathers in the church, in every age, have always attested this. The thing was quite unknown in the first and purest ages of the church, as is known by every man at all acquainted with the subject ; and Papists themselves know, that they cannot maintain the point but by barefaced forgery, lying, and impudence.

"It is an undoubted fact," says the Bishop, "that Peter's successors have always claimed this supreme authority, and have exercised it throughout the whole church, as occasion required, in every age, from the very beginning. Now, considering the nature of man, it is evidently impossible that any bishop of the church should have acquired such authority over all the rest, even in the most different nations and the most distant kingdoms, or that he could have exercised it every where among them, if it had not been given him from the beginning, and ordained by Jesus Christ." I admit that since the bishops of Rome pretended to be Peter's successors, they have always claimed this supreme authority, that is, more authority than Peter himself possessed ; but for ages after this apostle's death, there were none who pretended to be his successors, and of course none who claimed such authority. I request the reader not to take this on my word ; but to read all the histories that he can obtain, even those of Papists themselves, and he will find that what I assert is true.

The Bishop finds the Popè in possession of supreme power over all who choose to submit to him ; he takes it for granted, that he enjoys this as Peter's successor ; and he considers it impossible that he should have acquired such power over all other bishops, unless it had been given him from the beginning, and ordained by Jesus Christ. The same argument may be used on behalf of all the despots and wholesale murderers that have been in the world. This will give a divine origin to the religion of Mahomet, and to the usurpation of Buonaparte. To confine our remarks at present to the latter, if the mere possession of

absolute authority over the human race, be a proof that it emanates from Christ, then Buonaparte must have held his power under a divine right. It is not more wonderful that one bishop in the church should acquire authority over all the rest, by fraud and cunning, than that one French general should acquire power over all the rest by the same means, with the addition of the power of the sword, in the hands of thousands of soldiers whom he had won to support his cause. Both instances were no doubt divinely permitted, like every other usurpation upon the civil and religious rights of men; but the things themselves were according to the working of Satan.

It is asserted by Bishop Hay, that "considering the nature of man, it is evidently impossible that any one bishop should have acquired such authority over all the rest," &c. "if it had not been given him from the beginning, and ordained by Jesus Christ." Now, in opposition to his Reverence, I maintain, that it was from the very nature of man that such a thing was possible, and practicable, and that the attempt became successful. I speak of man as a sinful creature, estranged from the love of God, and the way of righteousness. Such a creature naturally desires to usurp the place of God upon any scale of usurpation that may appear attainable, from the low degree of making his own will the rule of his own conduct, up to the high degree of making his will the rule of conduct, not only of fellow creatures, but even of God himself. The radical vice of human nature is lust of power. This has appeared in the Church of Rome as much as it did in Pagan Rome, or in any kingdom whatever. Now where this passion exists in a high degree, with a corresponding degree of cunning and boldness, and where the state of society and other circumstances favour the design, the highest degree of power may be obtained by one man over his fellow creatures. One favourable circumstance for the attainment of such an object, is a state of general ignorance, and corruption of manners; and if the man who aims at supreme power be able to command a few agents possessed of some degree of knowledge, and animated by similar ambition, he may by degrees come to rule the world as he pleases. The bishops of Rome found society in the third and fourth centuries deplorably ignorant and vicious; and they found a numerous priesthood ready to aid them in deceiving the people, and building up the power of the see of Rome, expecting that Rome would, in return, help to establish their power in their respective sees and parishes. The plan succeeded, as the world knows to its cost; and it would be difficult to account for it, without "considering the nature of man," as deeply tainted with the love of power on the one hand, and on the other, immersed in ignorance and the love of vicious indulgence.



I do not recollect any other argument in favour of Peter's supremacy which I have not answered in my seventh Number, and in my later ones, beginning at the ninety-ninth.—I think it will appear to the satisfaction of the reader, that there is no evidence to be found in Scripture, that Peter was vicar of Christ, prince of the apostles, and visible head of the church. That Peter held no such office is the point which I have been endeavouring to establish ; and I leave the reader to decide whether or not I have succeeded. If I have, the main pillar of Popery is subverted ; and if I have not, I have yet other matter in reserve, which I hope will accomplish my purpose.

But in the mean time let us attend to what Papists maintain about the necessity of a visible head of the church on earth. Real Christians are content that there is a spiritual and glorious Head of the church at the right hand of God in heaven, to whom they can come with all their petitions, in the full confidence of having their sins forgiven and all their need supplied : but this is not enough for Papists. They must have a head on earth, who is a sinner like themselves, and who will indulge them in their sins, without damping their prospects of happiness in the other world ; and precisely such a head the Pope of Rome is, and has been, for many hundred years.

Bishop Hay asks ; “ Why did Christ institute one visible head of his church upon earth ? ” and he answers :—“ Because, as the church is a visible body, or society of men, it was most becoming they should have a visible supreme head among them, like to the members of whom the body is composed. Besides, as the church was ordained to spread over all nations, differing from one another in language, customs, government, and every thing else except religion, it would have been morally impossible to have kept them all united in one body, if there were not one common visible head of supreme authority among them, to which all must submit : so that this head of the church is the centre of unity, by which the church of Christ throughout the whole world, is joined in one body.” *Sincere Christian, chap. xii.*

In reply to this, I maintain, that the church of Christ is never represented in the New Testament as a visible body, having a visible head on earth ; and therefore all that the Bishop says about the necessity of such a head must go for nothing. He is not speaking of any particular or national church, and neither am I, but of the church of Christ ; that is, the whole body of believers in Christ, and the sanctified through his blood, of all kindreds, and tongues, and people, and nations. These were never meant to be one visible body on earth ; they could never all meet in one place, or be the subjects of one earthly head, in any sense of the word. They are all united to Christ, and to one another in him, who is really the head of his body, the

church ; and who never devolved the honour of this headship upon any creature. A mere human head could be of no use to such a body ; because it could communicate no life, and it could not take an oversight of all or of any of the members ; but Christ, by his word and Spirit, gives life to all the members of his body ; by the same divine influence, he unites them to himself, and to one another, in an invisible, but indissoluble bond of union ; he takes the oversight of every one of them ; he feeds his flock like a shepherd ; he leads them in the way of righteousness, and guides them with his eye.

To descend from this view of the Church of Christ and her divine Head, to the Church of Rome, and the Pope as her head, is such an example of the *βαθος*, or art of sinking, that I scarcely know how to write it. If the Pope were to limit his claim of headship to the Church of Rome, it might be conceded, that the head is good enough for the body ; but when he claims to be the head of the catholic or universal Church of Christ, the thing is more absurd and impious than human language can express.

The headship which the Pope claims over the church, makes him virtually head of the state also, in all countries where Popery is the established religion. He claims, and has conceded to him, an allegiance more sacred than subjects yield to their princes ; and from the hold which he has of the consciences of the people, by the agency of his priests, their allegiance to their civil rulers is just what the Pope pleases to make it. Nay, he is not satisfied with the allegiance of the subjects of all kings and princes where his religion prevails ; but he must have the allegiance of sovereign princes themselves ; and to these arrogant claims may be ascribed half the wars which desolated Europe for a thousand years.

Lord Clarendon, in his Introduction to his work entitled, "Religion and Policy," represents this usurpation of the bishop of Rome, as having been "without doubt the cause of more rapine, and the effusion of more blood, than all the ambition of other princes and usurpers that hath been since the death of our Saviour ; and," says he, "the propagation of Christianity hath been more obstructed by that obstinate, humorous, and senseless ambition, than by the arms and tyranny of the Turks and infidels. And how can we reasonably hope," continues his Lordship, "that those great and powerful princes, who command so much the greater part of the world, will ever embrace the Christian faith, when they know that they are not only thereby to cease to be Mahometans, but to cease to be monarchs, and admit another prince to have an equal, if not superior, command over their own subjects in their own dominions, and must cease to be emperors before they can be admitted to be Christians ? When our Saviour himself, whilst he was upon the earth, and

instituted that religion by which all men are to be saved, was so tender of, and jealous for, the entire power, prerogative, and privileges of kings and princes, that he would not suffer them either to be invaded or affronted for the advancement of the gospel itself; and consequently never intended, that by becoming Christians and followers of him, from being Jews and Gentiles, they should lose any of the pre-eminences they were possessed of; or that their subjects should pay them a less entire obedience and submission than they had formerly done; and when he intended that their conversion should be the most effectual means to reduce all the world to the faith of Christ; as indeed it was like to have been, till the Popes' usurpation of a spiritual distinct sovereignty obstructed the progress of it, and drove more from it, than ever it reconciled to it."

The same consideration must have a tendency to induce Mahometan and heathen princes to oppose the propagation of Christianity among their people. If Popery were Christianity, they would be sensible at once that they could not embrace it, without becoming subjects of a foreign power, and that none of their subjects could embrace it, without having their allegiance transferred to the Pope. If these princes were to see Christianity in its true character, as the friend of order and subordination, they could not oppose the propagation of it, without obstructing the peace and comfort of their subjects, as well as of themselves; but when they see Christianity only in the light of Popery, it is not surprising that they hate and oppose it, as the bane of every country into which it has found its way. But for Popery, the gospel might long ere now have been preached and believed throughout the whole world, as we hope it will be when Popery is destroyed; and as this grand consummation has been obstructed chiefly by the Church of Rome, for many centuries, that church, and all her adherents, may be expected to suffer, when the time shall arrive, the dreadful punishment which such wickedness deserves.

In showing how absurdly the Popes of Rome pretend to be the successors of Peter, I shall make considerable use, in my next Number, of the work of the noble and learned historian above quoted; and I shall make my extracts the more freely and largely, because I believe the work itself is in the possession of few, if any, of my readers on this side of the Tweed. I do not know a work of greater value in relation to this part of the controversy between Protestants and the Church of Rome. The edition before me, which, I believe, is the first and only one, was printed at Oxford as lately as 1791, with sufficient attestation of its authenticity. But before I give the result of Lord Clarendon's researches, I shall present the reader with the confused account

which the Popish historian, Dupin, gives of those whom he conceived to be Peter's successors in the see of Rome.

"Let us begin," says he, "with the successors of St. Peter, in the Church of Rome, the first and principal church." It is worth while to attend to this mode of expression. Dupin found, that during the first three centuries, there was not so much as a hint, that the Church of Rome was the catholic, or only true church of Christ; and he calls it only the first and principal church, for no reason that can be shown, but that Rome was the first and principal city at that time in the world. In what follows, he gives nothing as certain, with regard to Peter's successors, but only as a commonly received opinion hundreds of years after the period to which he refers.

"According to the common received opinion, to St. Peter succeeded St. Linus, to St. Linus, Anacletus or Cletus, and to him St. Clement. This order is observed by St. Irenæus, Eusebius, and St. Jerome, and in the ancient catalogues of the Popes; but Optatus, Rufinus, and St. Augustine, and some other Latin authors, substitute St. Clement immediately to St. Linus, and place Anacletus in the third rank. Some distinguish Cletus from Anacletus. The author of the Apostolical Constitutions says, that St. Linus was ordained by St. Paul, and St. Clement by St. Peter. St. Epiphanius conjectures, that St. Peter at first ordained St. Clement; but he refusing to accept the pontificate, and going out of the way, that St. Linus and St. Cletus did successively govern the Church of Rome, and that after the death of St. Peter, St. Clement succeeded to St. Cletus. The best way is to hold the most common and most ancient opinion." *Vol. ii. chap. 2.*

The plain English of the above is, that nothing is certainly known of the matter, which is a strong presumptive argument, that the knowledge of it is of no importance to the comfort and edification of Christians. The author tells us with great gravity, that after the death of St. Peter, St. Clement succeeded St. Linus; but he cannot tell, and no man in the world can tell, who was Peter's immediate successor, supposing it were admitted that he was bishop of Rome, which it is not. It is of no use to refer to a commonly received opinion, in the time of Eusebius or Augustine, hundreds of years after the thing is supposed to have happened, for they could know no more than we do. Dupin, writing of the succession of bishops in the see of Rome, tells us, that in the third century, after the death of St. Fabianus, the see of Rome was vacant a whole year. The Church of Rome has often been called a many-headed monster; but here she appears as a monster without a head, and how she could live a whole year in this state, is not easy to divine.

THE  
**Protestant,**

No. CIII.

---

SATURDAY, JULY 1st, 1820.

---

SUPPOSING it were granted that Peter was the first bishop of the church in Rome, the Pope would gain nothing by it, unless he were to become such a bishop as Christian bishops were, in those days. Amidst the immense population of that great city, the Christians who composed the church were a poor and despised company, ever exposed to the violence of their heathen neighbours and superiors; and their bishop or pastor, whoever he was, would be looked upon in no higher light than the ring-leader of the sect, and the principal object of hatred, by all the votaries of the idols of Rome. It is absurd to speak of a bishop, in these circumstances, having a see, and a chair, and a throne. These symbols of majesty, the Pope pretends to have derived from the first bishop of Rome; and doubtless there is as much justice in the pretence, as there is in the impositions practised at Loretto, where a gaudy image, dressed up in silk, and gold, and precious stones, is given out as a true representation of Mary, the wife of Joseph of Nazareth. Let the Pope put himself upon a footing of equality with his pretended predecessor. Let him go about preaching remission of sins, in the name of Jesus of Nazareth. Let him renounce the vanities of this world, as Peter did; and let him forbear meddling with the civil affairs of worldly kingdoms, which Peter claimed no right to do. In short, let him become a minister of the gospel, and, if any church shall call him to it, a bishop, in the New Testament sense of the word; and though I will not even then concede to him that he is Peter's successor, I will do him the greater honour of calling him one to whom the apostle would not have been ashamed to say, "The elders who are among you I exhort, being also an elder, and a witness of the sufferings of Christ, and a partaker of the glory that shall be revealed: feed the flock that is among you, taking the oversight thereof, not by constraint, but willingly; not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind; neither as being lords over God's heritage, but being ensamples to the flock: and when the chief Shep-

herd shall appear, ye shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away." 1 Pet. v. 1—4.

When Papists think of the see of Peter, they form in their minds an image of a peaceable and prosperous state of society, such as we may see in our own day, in what are called Christian countries, where bishops reign as kings, and where the people, if they be virtuously and peaceably disposed, may reign with them, in the enjoyment of all the happiness which the world can afford. When they think of the chair of Peter, they consider him as having occupied a seat of eminence, in a tranquil and unmolested seminary, like a professor of divinity, in one of our colleges. The chair, by degrees, is elevated to the dignity of a throne; and then Peter is considered as having been exactly what the Pope is now; or rather what he was five hundred years ago, when he reigned over the kingdoms, and even over the kings of the earth. But such notions are as absurd as the *Metamorphoses* of Ovid; and they have no more to do with truth than the *Arabian Nights' Entertainments*.

When the church in Rome, in the days of primitive purity, on the martyrdom of one bishop, were looking about for another, the question would not be, Who is the most cunning politician? or, who has the greatest number of crowned heads on his side? but, who is most ready, and most willing, to have his head cut off, or to be thrown alive to be devoured by wild beasts, for his confession of the name of Jesus? Such was the state of the church in Rome, for the first three centuries, that her bishops could claim scarcely any pre-eminence but that of suffering; and they had not even in this respect a pre-eminence over other bishops; though, in virtue of their more conspicuous place in the church, they would be more exposed than their private brethren.

I have made these general remarks, in order to introduce Lord Clarendon's account of what is known, or rather of what is not known, of Peter, and of those who are reported to have been his nearest successors:—"If we look," says he, vol. i. p. 12. "upon the fountain of all ecclesiastical story, from the time of the apostles even to that of Constantine, which was about 320 years, in which there were three and thirty Popes, we may reasonably say, that no rivulet conveyed any thing of moment from that pure fountain—of moment to us, more than what the Scripture itself tells us of the very history. There is not only no authority that obliges, but no reason that persuades us, to believe any thing positively in the transactions of the church or of churchmen; nor does it appear from whence we have the very lives of the apostles, and other holy men, which are derived to us; and which we have much more reason to suspect, because, as there was no collection of them in writing, till after Constantine's time,

so what was afterwards put in writing hath been oftentimes altered, many things having been reformed and left out, according to the discretion and gravity of the age; and that body of the lives of the saints, which hath now most reputation amongst the Catholics, was compiled but in our own age, by the Jesuit Ribadineyra, who was chaplain to Philip II. in England, when he married Queen Mary, and of whose skill in collecting history we may make some judgment, by what he hath left us of England; which, relating only to the transactions of twenty years, is so full of mistakes and errors, with reference to persons, times, and actions, that no Englishman, who is best versed in the accounts of that time, can receive any information. But, as I said before, his collection of the saints hath most reputation in all Catholic countries, or any other, and is translated into all languages, though it contains not half the particulars, even of St. Paul himself, as former and more ancient editions do; and yet it contains very much more than any learned and wise Catholic will seriously profess to believe.

“There is no consent in the very succession; very little pretence to jurisdiction over any other persons where themselves resided; and no mention of the manner of their election, and how they came to be chosen, till after three hundred years.”—His Lordship then gives an account of the confusion and contradictions of authors about the succession of the Popes, which is anticipated by the extract from Dupin, in my last Number, and then proceeds:—“And if their tradition be so uncertain an evidence of such an historical verity, in so few years after Christianity was first preached or professed, how can we, or any reasonable man, give credit to those allegations of many things done, and words spoken, by our Saviour himself, and of his apostles, for which they allege no other proof but tradition, so concealed between themselves, that nobody ever heard mention of either, till nine hundred years after the death of Christ? But let tradition be as weak and as partial a witness, as it must be still reckoned to be, we do deny that they have even such a witness for them; and, by the particular disquisition we shall make into every half age, and less, of the church, it will appear, that this their pretence is not in the least degree supported or favoured by tradition.”

The Pope claims to be head of the church, and as such to have jurisdiction over all other bishops; but his own oracle, tradition, gives him nothing of this in the first ages. “Towards any thing that looks like jurisdiction, (and how far it extended and was submitted to is not apparent) there is some dark mention of the bringing in of holy water, and of ordaining that no priest should say above one mass a day, by Pope Alexander the First;

and of the ordering of three to be said on Christmas eve, by Pope Telesphorus ; and of the appointing godfathers and godmothers in baptism, by Pope Hyginus, which the Anabaptists will hardly be persuaded to believe." Let it be observed, there is only a dark mention of these things by tradition, for we have no evidence that the words *mass* and *holy water* belonged to the phraseology of the second century, about the beginning of which, Alexander the First is said to have begun his *reign*. "The difference about Easter, indeed," continues his Lordship, "made a great noise, and divided the churches, and was determined by Pope Pius the First ; but revived and continued, with great passion and animosity, for forty years after, until Pope Victor, in a council at Rome, (which they say was the next lawful council to that of the apostles at Jerusalem) with as much passion, declared his judgment in that particular ; which is a shrewd evidence that the authority of Pope Pius was not considered with a full resignation. Some particulars of less moment, as the ordering that no vessels of wood should be used in the mass, but of glass, and shortly after, that cups of plate only should be used in that service, are mentioned to be established about or soon after that time.

"But in what manner those orders were issued and accepted, and what obedience was paid thereunto, is nowhere mentioned, and may be best guessed at by the respect that was given to Pope Pius, in the point of Easter. And certain it is, that no act of solemn jurisdiction, by the Pope, or church itself, will be found manifestly to have been done, till the emperor became Christian ; nor can it easily be conceived, that any of those edicts could be digested or published with any formality, or that they were communicated with less secrecy than the Pope concealed his own person or the place of his abode ; either of which was no sooner known than he was seized upon and carried to his execution." p. 15. It must be very evident that, in such circumstances, the church in Rome would have little to do with councils, or decrees, or jurisdiction over other churches ; and her bishops must have had something else to do than to think of lording it over other bishops. They would think it honour and privilege enough to be allowed to meet in the most private manner, to observe divine ordinances, to edify one another, and to fortify one another's minds in the prospect of death, which was constantly before them, and which many of them were called to suffer, in its most hideous forms, for no crime but that of being Christians. My learned author gives a number of particulars that clearly prove, by their own traditions, (if these can prove any thing), and by the writings of saints, in a later age, many of whom must have derived their materials from tradition, that no authority or jurisdiction, like that



afterwards claimed by the Pope, was understood to be vested in the church or bishop of Rome. The supposition, indeed, is absurd; for the thing was impossible in the then circumstances of the church. In condescension, I suppose, to popish authors, and not wishing to dispute about a word, Lord Clarendon speaks of the bishops of the church in Rome, from the beginning, under the name of Popes; but this word owes its birth to a much later age. The bishops or elders of all the churches might, in the way of respect, have been called fathers, that is, Papas, or Popes. It was not, however, till the bishop of Rome had obtained the ascendancy, that he was called, by way of distinction, *the Pope*; and those who afterwards wrote the histories and traditions of the church, in order to give the authority of antiquity to the name, and the usurpation which it expressed, gave the title to all the preceding bishops in that see. This has an imposing effect upon the mind of the reader. He reads of the Popes of Rome, in narratives which relate to the first and second centuries; and as he finds the bishops of no other church called by that name, he is insensibly led to think, that the Church of Rome and her bishops must have had a superiority of some kind, from the very beginning; but the charm will be dissolved, when he reflects, that the bishops of Rome were not called Popes in primitive times, either by themselves or their cotemporaries, but only by persons who wrote about them, after the Church of Rome, and the Pope as her head, had appeared as the Antichrist, and the oppressor of the true church.

Though the bishops of Rome were not in circumstances to exercise jurisdiction over other bishops and churches, till the emperor became Christian, and took them under his wing, it appears that, before that time, some of them had departed from the faith and purity of the first Christian bishops. We find that one of the holy fathers was not only guilty of idolatry, but also of denying the fact after it was detected. Marcellinus, who is placed about the end of the third century, "terrified by the persecution in the time of Dioclesian, (when, in thirty days, there were 17,000 Christians put to death for their religion,) preserved his life by sacrificing to the idol gods, and was for that scandal and impiety, they say, convened before a number of bishops, in Sinuessa, in the kingdom of Naples, who might more securely have met in Rome itself; he, for some days, passionately denied the charge, until he was convinced (convicted) by thirty witnesses, when he made great submission, professed great repentance, and declared that he deserved to be deposed, but the council refused to do it, for want of power; whereupon the dejected Pope assumed new and unnecessary courage, returned to Rome, defied and reviled the emperor to his face, till he caused his head to be cut off." *Religion and Policy*, p. 17.

Dupin professes to disbelieve this story, and he represents it as merely an accusation of the Donatists, (vol. ii. chap. vi.) ; but the Rhemish translators, in their note on Luke xxii. 31. admit the probability of it, as well as the fall of several other Popes, without derogating in the least from their infallibility ; because, though the men fell, the *chair* stood firm : that is, the Popes erred personally, but the office did not.

The election of one Pope, on the death of another, which is now a matter of great political interest, and has been, for more than a thousand years, does not appear to have been fixed by any definite rule, during the first three centuries. In the times of persecution, when the man who was chosen bishop to-day, was, on that very account, in danger of being murdered to-morrow, there was little temptation to aspire to the office, from worldly motives. The election was probably made by the people with so little noise, that no public notice would be taken of it ; and the individual, on whom the choice of his brethren fell, would consider himself called upon, by the voice of Providence, to accept the office, with all its labours and dangers, without ever thinking that he was thereby to become a sovereign prince, and the head of the whole church. There is not even a tradition, with regard to the mode of election in those days ; from which we may infer, that there was no controversy about the matter, but that, when the office became vacant, the people would exercise their Christian liberty, and invite the man whom they thought best qualified for the office, to preside over them as their bishop ; and it is not unreasonable to suppose, that they had sometimes more than one at a time, to preserve order and dispense ordinances, seeing they were cut off so rapidly by the sword of persecution.

“ To the end,” says Lord Clarendon, “ of Pope Marcellinus, who was put to death, in the year 307, there was no form prescribed for the election, nor any persons appointed, or who pretended power to elect ; and, it is probable enough, that the Pope dying might recommend his successor ; for, besides that, they say that St. Peter nominated St. Clement ; they say likewise that Stephen the First was recommended by Pope Lucius, that went before, who was the three and twentieth Pope ; and, it is very probable, that those pious persons, who were all martyrs, (for of the first three and thirty Popes, the last of which was Melchiades, who suffered in the tenth and last persecution, under the emperor Maximianus, there were not above three or four who died natural deaths,) I say, it is very probable that they had all so great a reverence and veneration from the people, that they were very willing to receive any man whom the Popes recommended to be their successors ; and most of the admittances being within five, or six, or seven, or eight days, after the death of

the last Pope, may persuade us that there was very little faction or formality in the election ; there being then no room for any ambition, (except it were for martyrdom), or any secure place to assemble in, for such business ; so that we may reasonably presume, that they who, during that long time, supplied that high office, did it rather by a general admission and acceptation, than by any formal election," page 20. One pastor about to die, *recommending* a successor, is perfectly consistent with Christian liberty ; and may, in many instances, be a Christian duty. I am only sorry that the author should have dishonoured the holy men of whom he speaks, by calling them Popes.

Our next inquiry shall be, to discover what claim or exercise the Popes had to any jurisdiction, in other kingdoms and states, in or after the reign of Constantine, and whence they derived it - and what opposition and contradiction they met withal, from time to time, by which the ancient opinion of antiquity will best appear.

"It is agreed, I think, on all hands, that Silvester the First was bishop of Rome, when Constantine came to be emperor ; though there is no mention what interval there was between the death of Melchiades and the election of Silvester, or in what manner he was chosen ; and there seems to be some contradiction in the authors about the computation of that time ; for Silvester is said to have reigned three and twenty years and ten months, and to have died in the year 334, whereas it was in the year 321 that Melchiades was put to death ; between which several times, there are but thirteen years, or thereabouts. However, it appears that Silvester was then Pope, and, some authors will have it, that Constantine was christened by him. Sure it is, that as that emperor: performed many acts of piety, in building of churches in several places, for the exercise of the Christian religion, so he paid great respect to Pope Silvester, and gave him a rich crown, which they say he never wore himself, though he left it to his successors," page 21. It will readily occur to every reader, that from that day the bishop of Rome would appear in a new character. To every carnal mind, the crown of gold would have more attractions than the crown of martyrdom. Unconverted men, mere heathens in principle, would now profess themselves Christians, as a step towards the favour of the emperor ; and they would insinuate themselves into the priesthood, with the view of one day obtaining the rich crown. Crowns are not made for nothing ; they are not worn for mere ornament. A man wearing a crown, without the sovereign power, of which it is a sign, would be an object of contempt to himself, and to all the world. Having obtained this shadow of sovereign power, the bishops of Rome could not rest till they obtained also the sub-

stance, which they did, in the course of a few ages. Every successive Pope kept this object steadily in his eye; and the uniformity and harmony of their exertions, for hundreds of years, without so much as one instance of a Pope undoing what his predecessors had done, in the way of advancing the power of his see, shows clearly, that it was one spirit that animated the whole, namely, the wicked One, who worketh with all deceivableness of unrighteousness. I do not suppose that Silvester's immediate successor, to whom the crown was bequeathed, or his successors for a hundred years, contemplated the giddy height to which their remote successors were to rise; but it was the study of every one to add something to the power and influence which he had received from his predecessor, and thus to raise his see to sovereign authority over every other.

The authority of Silvester, notwithstanding the favour of the emperor, does not seem to have been very extensive. The council of Nice was held in his time, but he does not appear to have had a voice in it, much less authority over it. Constantine himself was present in this council, and he alone confirmed the decrees and acts thereof, and sent them so confirmed to Pope Silvester, who thereupon called a council at Rome, of 267 bishops, who confirmed all that had been done at Nice, which confirmation was no other than a submission and conformity thereunto; as the council at Granada, in Spain, which was then likewise assembled, and is called the first Eliberitan council, likewise did. And there needs no other evidence of the emperor's supreme authority in that council, than his letter to all churches, for the due observance of all that was done at Nice, and for the observation of Easter, and the burning of all books written by Arius, which he commanded to be done in a very imperial style: "*Si quid autem scriptum ab Ario compositum reperiatur, ut igni id tradatur volumus; ut non modo improba ejus doctrina abrogetur, verum etiam ne monumentum quidem aliquod ejus, relinquatur: Illud equidem predictum volo; si quis libellum aliquem ab Ario conscriptum celare, nec continuo igni comburere deprehensus fuerit, supplicium ei mortis esse constitutum. i. e.* But if any writing, composed by Arius, be got hold of, our will is, that it be committed to the flames; that not only his accursed doctrines be extirpated, but also, that not even the slightest vestige of him may be left. This, also, I desire to be proclaimed, that if any person is caught concealing any treatise written by Arius, or neglecting instantly to burn it, the punishment ordained for him is death."

With the next Number, which is intended to conclude the second volume, a Title Page and Table of Contents will be given.

THE  
**Protestant,**

No. CIV.

---

SATURDAY, JULY 8th, 1820.

---

THE bishop of Rome, having got the emperor of Rome on his side, began to strut and swagger at a mighty rate. Then he would have all the world submit to him, in matters of religion, even as they submitted to the emperor in secular and civil matters. The world, however, or rather the churches in different parts of the world, were not yet so submissive. Some bishops, in the east, had held a council, without asking leave of the bishop of Rome. Julius, the Pope of the day, reprehended them for their presumption; and they, knowing that they owed him no subjection, treated the reprehension with great contempt, and, shortly after, met in a council at Antioch. *See Religion and Policy, vol. i. p. 23.* This was in the fourth century, from which the reader will see, that it was a long time after the death of Peter, ere his pretended successors even laid claim to the power which they afterwards possessed; and that, after the claim was made, it was for a time indignantly resisted.

The bishops of Rome continued, from age to age, adding to their power, and encroaching upon the liberties of the people. "We now come," says Lord Clarendon, "to the time of Gregory the First, (afterwards surnamed the Great), who, being a monk of St. Bennett's order, wrote a letter to the emperor Mauritius, beseeching him not to approve of his election, and fled to a mountain, to avoid being found, until he was discovered by a pigeon; and when he could not avoid the acceptance of his office, to shew his great humility, he introduced a new style into his bulls; for he was the first who inserted that expression, *Servus servorum Dei*, (Servant of the servants of God,) though Monsieur Mazeray (who deserves to be looked upon as the most accurate and impartial historian this age hath produced) assures us, that the title of Pope, of Father of the church, of His Holiness, of Pontifex, Maximus, of *Servus servorum Dei*, were common to all bishops before his time, of which we shall say more

hereafter. But let him be as humble in his title as he please, it cannot be denied, that, from the time that he was Pope, he used all the means he could, fair and foul, to make himself greater than any of his predecessors. And so indeed he did ; for, notwithstanding all his obligations to the emperor Mauritius, and the professions he had made to him, Phocas no sooner rebelled and killed Mauritius, and made himself emperor, than Pope Gregory acknowledged him, sent a legate *de latere* to him, gave him all the assistance and countenance he could to support his wicked action and title, and received again from him all those offices which might contribute to his own greatness : and he did indeed many great things, and raised the papacy to a higher pitch than ever it had been at : and this was about the year 600, for he died not till 605.”—*Religion and Policy*, vol. i. p. 47.

As this was the most important era of the papacy, and as the events, above referred to, prepared the way for the bishop of Rome’s being declared universal bishop, it may be worth while to enter a little more into detail ; and I shall merely remark, in passing, that if it were true that the Popes, as the successors of Peter, were to be really the head of the Catholic church, and universal bishops, it is somewhat strange, that 600 years should elapse ere the church was favoured with this head on earth, which is now declared, by all good Papists, to be so necessary to her existence.

Gregory the Great will be allowed to have been, in comparison with some, a good, and in comparison with others, a great man ; but these very qualities gave him the power of exalting the dignity of his see above all its former greatness. “ It has ever been,” says Bower, in his life of this Pope, “ even from the earliest times, a maxim with the Popes, never to part with any power or jurisdiction which their predecessors had acquired, by what means soever they had acquired it ; nor to give up the least privilege, which any of their predecessors, right or wrong, ever had claimed. From that maxim no Pope has hitherto swerved, no, not Gregory himself, however conscientious, just, and scrupulously religious, in other respects.”

It fell out, during the reign of this Pope, that the bishop of Constantinople began to assume the title of universal bishop, or patriarch ; and it appears, that he had, at least, the authority of one council, and the consent of one emperor, for his so doing. Constantinople was now an imperial city, as well as Rome. It threatened to become even *the* imperial city ; and who could then deny its bishop the title of *the œcumenical* or *universal bishop* ? When Gregory heard of the new title of one whom he considered his inferior, he became dreadfully alarmed, as well he might ; for it now depended upon the caprice of an emperor or

empress, whether Rome or Constantinople should be the mother and mistress of all churches. Gregory, for a time, forgot all other cares. He saw the very Christian religion in imminent danger; not because the bishop of Constantinople had assumed a higher title than he possessed, but because the title itself, as he maintained, was impious and antichristian. He wrote letters to his nuncio at Constantinople, (for Popes, by this time, had their ambassadors at foreign courts), charging him, as he tendered the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, to use his utmost endeavours with the emperor and with the empress, and above all, with the bishop himself, his beloved brother, to divert him from ever more using the *proud*, the *profane*, the *antichristian* title of universal bishop. Such, let it be observed, was Pope Gregory the Great's opinion of the title which has been borne by his successors for twelve hundred years. His nuncio did all that he could to persuade the eastern patriarch to renounce his new title; but he could not prevail. It had been bestowed upon him, he said, by a great council, and not upon him alone, but also on his successors; that he had not power to resign it, nor would his successors stand to his resignation, if he should.

Gregory afterwards wrote a long letter to the patriarch himself, loading the title of universal bishop with all the opprobrious names he could think of; calling it vain, ambitious, execrable, antichristian, blasphemous, infernal, diabolical; and applying to him who assumed it what was said by the prophet Isaiah of Lucifer: "Whom do you imitate," says he, "in assuming that arrogant title? whom but him, who, swelled with pride, exalting himself above so many legions of angels, his equals, that he might be subject to none, and all might be subject to him?" "The apostle Peter," continues Pope Gregory, "was the first member of the universal church. As for Paul, Andrew, and John, they were only the heads of particular congregations; but all were members of the church under one head, and none would ever be called UNIVERSAL." Here is a plain avowal, by a Pope, that no Pope, or even apostle, possessed the authority of universal bishop, or head of the church. "Again," says Pope Gregory to his dear brother of Constantinople, "if none of the apostles would be called universal, what will you answer on the last day to Christ, the Head of the church universal? You, who, by arrogating that name, strive to subject all his members to yourself."—"But this is the time which Christ himself foretold; the earth is now laid waste and destroyed, with the plague and the sword; all things that have been predicted are now accomplished; the king of pride, that is, antichrist, is at hand; and what I dread to say, an army of priests is ready to receive him; for they who were chosen to point out to others the way of humility and

meekness, are themselves now become the slaves of pride and ambition." *Greg. l. 4. ep. 32.* If any Pope had written in the same style a thousand years after, he would have been called a reformer, and a follower of Luther and Calvin.

Finding it impossible to make any impression upon the stubborn patriarch, or Pope of the east, Gregory wrote letters to both the emperor and the empress, begging and beseeching them to prevail upon the said patriarch to give up his diabolical title. After declaiming against the title, as quite antichristian, against the patriarch, as a disturber of the peace of the church, and the good order established by Christ, and against all who encouraged him in so impious and detestable an attempt, he addresses the empress thus: "Though Gregory (speaking of himself) is guilty of many great sins, for which he well deserves thus to be punished, Peter is himself guilty of no sins, nor ought he to suffer for mine. I therefore, over and over again, beg, intreat, and conjure you by the Almighty, not to forsake the virtuous steps of your ancestors, but, treading in them, to court and secure to yourself the protection and favour of that apostle, who is not to be robbed of the honour that is due to his merit, for the sins of one who has no merit, and who so unworthily serves him."

*Greg. l. 4. ep. 34.* Here Gregory lets out the secret cause of his opposition to the title assumed by the bishop of Constantinople. It was derogatory to the see of Peter, which he himself had the honour to fill. It was therefore antichristian, diabolical, and every thing else that is bad.

He was as unsuccessful with the emperor and the empress, as he had been with the patriarch himself; nay, the emperor rather favoured the new title, as befitting the bishop of what he now wished to be considered the imperial city. Gregory, almost in despair, wrote letters to some of the greatest bishops in the east, endeavouring to excite their zeal against the proud title assumed by their patriarch. The bishop of Alexandria wrote a letter to Gregory, in which he calls him also universal bishop, thinking it would end the controversy, if the two rivals were called by the same title, and put upon a footing of equality; but Gregory spurned at this with great indignation: "If," says he, in his reply, "you give more to me than is due to me, you rob yourself of what is due to you. I choose to be distinguished by my manners, and not by titles. Nothing can redound to my honour that redounds to the dishonour of my brethren. I place my honour in maintaining them in theirs. If you call me universal Pope, you thereby own yourself to be no Pope. Let no such titles, therefore, be mentioned, or ever heard among us. Your Holiness says in your letter that I commanded you. I command *you!* I know who you are, who I am. In rank you are my



brother, by your manners my father. I therefore did not command; and I beg you will henceforth ever forbear the word. I only pointed out to you what I thought it was right you should know." *Greg. l. 7. ep. 36. See Bower's Lives of the Popes:—Life of Gregory.*

Perhaps it would be uncandid to say, that all this was said in hypocrisy, while Gregory was really labouring to get the obnoxious title transferred to himself alone. There are circumstances, however, which excite a strong suspicion that it was even so. Seeing the emperor, Mauritius, did not enter into his views, but that he countenanced the bishop of Constantinople, Gregory seems so far to have withdrawn his allegiance from him, as to rejoice in the successful treason of Phocas, who murdered his master and his children, and was proclaimed emperor in his stead. Gregory was unable to contain his joy at this event. He wrote Phocas in the most fulsome style of congratulation. "We," says he, "have been hitherto most grievously afflicted; but the Almighty hath chosen you, and placed you on the imperial throne, to banish, by your merciful disposition, all our afflictions and sorrows. Let the heavens therefore rejoice, let the earth leap for joy, let the whole people return thanks for so happy a change. May the republic long enjoy these most happy times! May God, with his grace, direct your heart in every good thought, in every good deed! May the Holy Ghost, that dwells in your breast, ever guide and assist you, and that you may, after a long course of years, pass from an earthly and temporal to an everlasting and heavenly kingdom."

Phocas received the imperial throne by treason and murder; and when in possession of absolute power, he shewed himself as great a monster of cruelty and wickedness, as any of his predecessors had been; but Pope Gregory the Great lauds him, and praises him, and calls upon heaven and earth to praise him, for no other reason, so far as appears, than that he would deliver the see of Rome from the disgrace of having the patriarch of Constantinople preferred before the bishop of Rome, under the title of universal bishop. It was the manner of Popes to attach themselves to those successful monsters who could help them to the attainment of the object of their ambition; and they again lent all their influence to confirm such monsters in the power which they had usurped. If you will get me proclaimed emperor, I shall take care that you be proclaimed universal bishop, seems to have been the understanding between the traitor and murderer, Phocas, and the most holy father of the Church of Rome. The thing was done. Phocas became emperor; and though Gregory did not live to enjoy all the fruits of this revolution; though he did not receive, in his own person, the high title of universal

bishop, Phocas lived to confer it upon one of the Popes within three years of the death of Gregory. Yes, Boniface III. prevailed upon the bloody monster, Phocas, to revoke the decree, settling the title of universal bishop on the patriarch of Constantinople; and he got a new decree, settling this title upon himself and his successors. Gregory the Great had condemned this title, as vain, proud, profane, impious, execrable, blasphemous, anti-christian, heretical, diabolical; but no matter; when it came to be applied to the Pope of Rome, it was all good and lawful. It has been claimed and borne by the Popes to this very day; and therefore, they are justly chargeable with all the blasphemy and execrableness which their great Father, *saint Gregory*, laid to the account of it.

Now indeed the Pope appeared as a god on earth. He sat in the temple of God, shewing himself as God. He received his high dignity from a traitor and a murderer; and, it must be allowed, that the power which it conferred has been often exercised in a manner corresponding with its origin, and the character of him who conferred it. The title of universal bishop, as vested in the patriarch of Constantinople, seems to have been no more than a badge of honour; at least he did not pretend to universal jurisdiction in virtue of it. But no sooner was the title transferred to the Pope of Rome, and he thereby declared head of the church, than he began to show his power and authority in a very arbitrary manner. He immediately called a council at Rome, and had it decreed, that no election of a bishop should thenceforth be deemed lawful and good, unless made by the people and clergy, approved by the prince or lord of the city, and *confirmed by the Pope*, interposing his authority in the following terms: We will and command, *volumus et jubemus*. See *Bower's Life of Boniface*. This bound the bishops, in all countries, to the Pope of Rome, through them it bound all the inferior priests, and through them, all the people to the same supreme head, so that in fact the Pope became absolute monarch of what was called christendom. It is true that some countries yielded more prompt obedience than others, and some never submitted at all; but these were comparatively few, at least in the western empire. Thus was the papal supremacy introduced and established, in the year 607, which is usually marked as one of those periods at which the prophetic number of 1260 years is understood to commence.

The Pope, however, was not yet high enough. He had got the full command of the spiritual sword, but the temporal one was also necessary, in order to give the necessary effect to the other. A temporal kingdom, and the power of calling out an armed force were necessary, in order to his maintaining the

dignity to which he had attained. It is true, the Pope never made any great figure, as a military commander ; but he found it necessary, in order to the maintenance of his dignity, to get the sovereign power over certain portions of rich territory in Italy ; and he obtained this by the aid of another traitor, whose usurpation he encouraged. This was Pepin, who was a sort of prime minister to Childeric, king of France. The king was a silly, and the minister was a clever man ; and the latter saw no good reason why he should not occupy the place of the former. He resolved, therefore, to take the opinion of the Pope, as upon a question of morality, or divinity, or casuistry, or politics, no matter which. The question which he proposed to his Holiness, was, " Who best deserved to be styled king ; he who was possessed of the power, or he who was only possessed of the title ? " The crafty Pope, says Bower, in his *Life of Pope Zachary*, well understood the true meaning of that question ; and therefore solved it, we may be sure, in favour of Pepin ; declaring that, " in his opinion, he ought rather to be styled king, who possessed the power, than he who possessed only the title."

Pepin had now what would be received as a divine authority, for supplanting his master, king Childeric ; and this was immediately done. Most of the great men in the kingdom were Pepin's creatures and dependants, and therefore easily brought over to maintain his title to the kingdom. Now, as one good turn deserves another, the Pope naturally looked to Pepin, as one able and willing to advance his power and dignity. The Pope of the day did not live to reap the fruit of his good offices, on behalf of the usurper ; but, as usual, his successor took advantage of his labours, and improved them for the aggrandizement of the holy see. Stephen II. successor of Zachary, had a quarrel with the king of the Lombards ; and the holy father, being unable to cope with so powerful a prince, applied once and again to Pepin, now king of France, to help him. Pepin acknowledged his obligations to his holy father ; and brought such a powerful force, to bear upon the king of the Lombards, as soon made him submit, and promise to give up the territory, which he had violently taken from the emperor, not to the rightful owner, from whom he had taken it, but to the holy see of St. Peter, so as to make the holy apostle appear to the world as no better than a resetter of theft.

The king of the Lombards, however, after Pepin had withdrawn his army, refused to perform his promise. He attacked the Pope a second time. He besieged Rome itself, and reduced the city to the greatest extremity ; when the poor Pope was obliged to apply to Pepin again, to save his city and his life. He first addressed a letter to Pepin, as from himself, in the

following style :—" To defend the church is, of all works, the most meritorious ; and that to which is reserved the greatest reward in the world to come. God might himself have defended his church, or raised up others to defend the just rights of his apostle, St. Peter. But it pleased him to choose you, my most excellent son, out of the whole human race, for that holy purpose. For it was in compliance with his divine inspiration and command, that I applied to you, that I came into your kingdom, that I exhorted you to espouse the cause of his beloved apostle, and your great protector, St. Peter. You espoused his cause accordingly ; and your zeal for his honour was quickly rewarded with a signal and miraculous victory. But St. Peter, my most excellent son, has not yet reaped the least advantage from so glorious a victory, though owing entirely to him. The perfidious and wicked Aistulphus (the king of the Lombards) has not yet yielded to him one foot of ground ; nay, unmindful of his oath, and actuated by the devil, he has begun hostilities anew, and, bidding defiance both to you and St. Peter, threatens us, and the whole Roman people, with death and destruction." The Pope, however, doubtful of the effect of his own eloquence upon the mind of the French monarch, is said to have procured a letter from the apostle Peter himself, which he sent to Pepin as a genuine epistle from his great predecessor, the prince of the apostles. The following is an extract, from which, I am afraid my readers will infer, that Peter did not improve in the art of letter-writing after he left this world :—" Simon Peter, a servant and apostle of Jesus Christ, to the three most excellent kings, Pepin, Charles, and Carloman ; (the two last were Pepin's sons) to all the holy bishops, abbots, presbyters, and monks ; to all the dukes, counts, commanders of the French army ; and to the whole people of France : Grace unto you and peace be multiplied."—" I am the apostle Peter, to whom it was said, Thou art Peter, and upon this rock, &c. Feed my sheep, &c. And to thee will I give the keys, &c. As this was all said to me in particular, all who hearken to me, and obey my exhortations, may persuade themselves, and firmly believe that their sins are forgiven them."—" Harken, therefore, to me, to me Peter, the apostle and servant of Jesus Christ ; and since I have preferred you to all the nations of the earth, hasten, I beseech and conjure you, if you care to be cleansed from your sins, and to earn an eternal reward, hasten to the relief of my city, of my church, of the people committed to my care, ready to fall into the hands of the wicked Lombards, their merciless enemies. It has pleased the Almighty that my body should rest in this city ; the body that has suffered, for the sake of Christ, such exquisite torments : And can you, my most Christian sons, stand by unconcerned ; and see it insulted by

the most wicked of nations? No, let it never be said, and it will I hope, never be said, that I, the apostle of Jesus Christ, that my apostolic church, the foundation of the faith, that my flock recommended to you by me and my vicar, have trusted in you, but trusted in vain. Our lady, the virgin Mary, the mother of God, joins in earnestly intreating, nay, and commands you to hasten, to run, to fly to the relief of my favourite people, reduced almost to the last gasp; and calling in that extremity, night and day, upon her, and upon me. The thrones and dominions, the principalities and the powers, and the whole multitude of the heavenly host, intreat you, together with us, not to delay, but to come with all possible speed, and rescue my chosen flock from the jaws of the ravening wolves, ready to devour them. My vicar might, in this extremity, have recurred, and not in vain, to other nations; but, with me, the French are, and ever have been, the first, the best, the most deserving of all nations; and I would not suffer the reward, the exceeding great reward, that is reserved in this and the other world, for those who shall deliver my people, to be earned by any other." *Bower's Life of Stephen II.*

It is difficult to say what effect the eloquence of the holy apostle might have had upon the mind of Pepin and his two sons, had it arrived in time; for as no swift angelic messenger was employed, Pepin had left France with an army, to help the Pope, before Peter's letter reached him. He effectually subdued the king of the Lombards. He took the provinces and cities, which Aistulphus had taken from the emperor, and most magnanimously gave them to the Pope, thus enriching the holy see with what was not his own.

Thus was the bishop of Rome raised to the rank and sovereignty of a great prince. This is usually considered the last step of his elevation. It took place in the year 756; and this, I believe, is the latest period to which the commencement of the prophetic number of 1260 years is referred. Supposing the book of Revelation to have been written in the year 90, which is the period usually assigned to it, the time which elapsed between that and the last stage of papal usurpation, is precisely 666 years, which reminds us of the number of the name of the beast, Rev. xiii. 18. I mention this merely in passing, as it is by no means my intention to enter, at present, upon the Apocalyptical signs of Antichrist. To those who wish to see this subject discussed, in a serious and sensible manner, I beg leave to recommend a pamphlet, just published, by the Rev. Mr. Mason, of Wishatown, on Daniel's Prophetic Number of 2300 days.











